FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 009 14 January 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Gromyko TV 'Conversation' With Political Observers AA 1
Lomeyko on Prospects for Soviet-U.S. Arms Talks [Prague] AA 16
PRAVDA Cites U.S. Reaction to Geneva Talks [12 Jan] AA 17
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views Soviet Peace Initiatives [12 Jan] AA 19
PRAVDA Cites PRC Paper on Shultz-Gromyko Talks [11 Jan] AA 21

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Summit Linked to Chernenko's Health [AFP] BB 1
Rohlicek Arrives in Moscow for CEMA Session [Prague] BB 1
LATE REPORT: Warsaw Pact Session Postponed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jan] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions & Answers' [Kasparov, Zholkver, Tsvetov, Shishlin, Kachanov] CC 1
  U.S.-Soviet Talks CC 1
  NATO Described CC 3
  U.S.-Canada Defense Treaty CC 3
  Japanese Foreign Aid CC 4
TRUD on Trade Unions' Struggle for Peace, Jobs [11 Jan] CC 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Pershing Incident Shows Dangers of Deployment A 1
  Pentagon Worried About Protests A 1

CHINA

Observer Comments on General Vessey's PRC Visit [Ivanov] B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

PRAVDA Cites NODONG SINMUN on Liberation [10 Jan] C 1
TASS Previews Nakasone Visit to South Pacific C 1

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Continues Celebration of PDPA Jubilee D 1
  Karmal Addresses Ceremony [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jan] D 1
  Anniversary Activities Noted D 3
  CPSU Delegation Departs D 3
Iran's 'Act of Hostility' Against DRA Condemned D 3
PRAVDA Notes Continuing U.S. Aid to Dushmans [11 Jan] D 4

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

U.S. Envoy Views France's New Caledonia Problems E 1
New Zealand's Lange Confirms Nuclear Ships Policy [Golovnin] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Cites Jablonski on Polish, World Situation [11 Jan] F 1
Olszowski Address at Anniversary Meeting Cited F 1
NEW TIMES on Reasons for Building Berlin Wall [No 52] F 1
Soviet-Albanian Cooperation Noted on Anniversary [IZVESTIYA 12 Jan] F 3
  Friendship Group Meets [PRAVDA 11 Jan] F 4
Baybakov Meets With CSSR's Husak in Prague [PRAVDA 12 Jan] F 5
Briefs: Hungarian Amity Protocol; GDR Cinematography Plan F 5

WESTERN EUROPE

Gromyko, French Envoy Exchange Luncheon Toasts [PRAVDA 13 Jan] G 1
U.S. To 'Secretly' Bring Missiles to Belgium [IZVESTIYA 11 Jan] G 1
Poll Shows Belgians Against Missile Deployment G 2
U.S. 'Nuclear Mines' in FRG Draw Protests [IZVESTIYA 11 Jan] G 2
  FRG Creating Confusion [Ostrogorskiy] G 3
Commentary on Poisonous Gas Leak in Sweden [Olin] G 3
Soviet-Finnish Cooperation Talks End in Helsinki [PRAVDA 13 Jan] G 4
NATO Pressuring Spain Into Active Participation [Khabarov] G 5
New Foundation To Increase Lisbon's Dependence G 6
Turkish Minister Against Missile Deployment G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Mahmud 'Abbas, PLO Delegation Visit USSR 6-11 Jan H 1
  Exchange of Views Held H 1
  KUNA Interviews 'Abbas H 1
Israeli Transport of Ethiopian Jews Condemned H 2
TASS Cites Iranian, Iraqi Battle Reports H 3
  8 January H 3
  14 January H 3

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Salvadoran Revolutionaries Give Press Conference K 1
Castro Gives Speech on C. American Situation K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Afanasyev on Improving Developed Socialism [PRAVDA 11 Jan] R 1
Officials Discuss Ideological Work Conference R 7
Grishin Attends Moscow Komsomol Conference R 9
Shcherbitskiy Addresses Ukraine Party Secretaries R 9
AFP: FRG Intelligence Sources on KGB Defector R 9
RSFSR Ministers Approve Nature Protection Plan R 10
RSFSR Procurement, Cinematography Heads Replaced [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Jan] R 10
Briefs: New Estonian Party Journal R 10

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Baybakov Interviewed on 1985 Economic Tasks [NEDELYA No 1] S 1
NOVOSTI Observer on USSR Economic Innovations [Breus in Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 9 Jan] S 8
Briefs: Arctic Navigation Season Begins; Antarctic Air Bridge Laid S 9

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Achievements, Problems in Animal Husbandry Cited [Kozhevnikov] T 1
Harsh Winter's Effects on Agriculture Noted [Ruvinskiy] T 2
Weather Damage Reported in Belgorod Oblast T 3

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Japanese TV on Soviet Forces, Weapons V 1
  General Ivanov Interview V 1

GROMYKO TV 'CONVERSATION' WITH POLITICAL OBSERVERS

LD131539 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Jan 85

[Studio "conversation" between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko and political observers Yuriy Zhukov, Valentin Zorin, Vikentiy Matveyev, and Vladimir Bogachev -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Gromyko] First, I would like to welcome you. You are familiar faces to me. You probably have quite a few questions. Please, ask me these questions, and I shall try to answer them.

[Zhukov] Andrey Andreyevich, your meeting in Geneva with Secretary of State Shultz has aroused great interest both here in our country and abroad. How would you evaluate the results of this meeting as a whole?

[Gromyko] On the whole, we evaluate the results of the meeting positively. The joint Soviet-American statement does indeed speak for itself. We agreed on the subject of the coming talks and on the goals which should be achieved as a result of the negotiations. This is of course very important.

[Zorin] Andrey Andreyevich, you said the questions of nuclear and space weapons will be discussed at the forthcoming negotiations as a complex, that is, as interconnected matters. This is a quite new approach. What brought it about?

[Gromyko] It was brought about by this: If one is striving to stop the arms race, to eliminate the threat of war -- in a word, if one is striving for lasting peace, then it is essential that the arms race should not begin in space and should be stopped on earth, on the earth as a planet. This was the chief task which faced the participants in the Geneva meeting.

There was very strong pressure by the American Administration not to permit the examination of questions of space, to work toward having the sphere of space open for the arms race. As we have said so many times, including on the eve of the Geneva meeting, this position is totally unacceptable. Agreement upon the conditions for this meeting did not go smoothly, but in the end it was agreed that this question can and must be discussed. As you know, space also figures in the statement, and the prevailing viewpoint is that it is impossible to examine either the question of strategic armaments or the question of intermediate-range nuclear weapons without examining the question of space, or more precisely, the question of averting an arms race in space. In the end the American side agreed to adopt such a viewpoint. This fact is a positive one.

I would like to say here that after my return from Geneva, and, correspondingly, after the return of U.S. Secretary of State Shultz to Washington, he sent me a letter -- I recieved it here in Moscow -- which said that the U.S. Administration intends to fulfill that which was agreed upon in Geneva, and that it is serious about the obligations it assumed in accordance with this agreement. This is a positive indicator. As the saying goes, we shall see what we shall see.

[Matveyev] Andrey Andreyevich, since so much importance is attached to the questions of space arms and since they have such key significance for progress at the talks, what can be said about the essence of the difference in the approaches of our country and those of the United States to these questions?

[Gromyko] The essence consists exactly in setting the space issue aside and dealing only with those types of arms on which talks have already been held: ground-based strategic nuclear arms and medium-range arms, including nuclear, in Europe.

At least this was expressed with the greatest clarity before the Geneva meeting. The point is this: The Soviet Union categorically objected to such a viewpoint. It was of the opinion and is of the opinion that it is impossible to set the space issue to one side. In the final analysis, one can, theoretically, imagine a situation in which success has been reached regarding the questions of strategic arms and the questions of medium-range nuclear arms. I repeat: Success has been reached -- but what is taking place in space is the arms race, being filled up increasingly with corresponding types of arms. Not only would this bring to nought what has been done on earth, but it would take things even further and as a result the balance, as far as peace is concerned, would be a negative one.

The situation would be complicated and even more dangerous. This we said with all directness to the U.S. Administration; we told its allies about it; we told the whole world about it; and we also said this in Geneva. Moreover, we spoke firmly and -- I am ready to use such a word -- sharply. We wanted the U.S. Administration and those who have supported and who now support its viewpoint regarding the questions of space to become aware of this.

The conclusions we reached we repeated in Geneva, too. It is as follows: that it is impossible to examine productively the questions of strategic nuclear arms and the questions of medium-range nuclear arms without examining the questions of space and outer space.

[Bogachev] Andrey Andreyevich, what specifically is meant when we say that the Soviet Union is resolutely against militarization of space?

[Gromyko] What did we mean? We meant that arms intended for use against targets in space should be banned categorically and also that arms intended for use from space against the earth as a planet -- in other words, against targets on the ground, in the sea and in the air -- should be banned categorically. We constantly stressed this viewpoint. Well, this is what we meant and this is what we still mean.

[Zorin] Andrey Andreyevich, those who were able to observe the course of the Geneva talks at close quarters, so to speak, got the impression that these talks were not easy at all. Is that the case?

[Gromyko] One can say this: The talks were not easy at all. I would say that at times they were very complicated, if not tense, in the political sense of the word. Of course, we did not hammer our fists on the table and did not throw our glasses on the table [laughter], but that is what they were like. However, on the whole -- and I want to stress this -- they were businesslike and serious, and frank, I repeat, frank, in the sense that this term is usually used when one speaks about talks during which the sides were not afraid to speak their minds perfectly clearly and did not always bother with politeness.

[Matveyev] Andrey Andreyevich, in connection with this I have a question about the U.S. large-scale missile defense program. When they usually talk about such a defense in Washington, they claim that they do not intend to test and deploy such systems in outer space, but merely want to restrict themselves, so to speak, to scientifc research work which, they say, does not run counter to the antimissile defense treaty. Well how, in your opinion, should one react to this American position?

[Gromyko] I must tell you that in the course of a long period of time supporters of this plan in the United States -- the plan for so-called large-scale missile defense -- submerged, so to speak, certain elements, certain stages of this problem, and made no differentiation between them.

Later, when they sensed that, naturally, this entire position was a weak one, and under the pressure of criticism, and -- I would say -- exposure of the essence of it, they amended it somewhat and came to the conclusion that the stationing of such facilities and their testing might be prohibited. They told us this clearly in Geneva, for the first time, even. They told us clearly in Geneva.

And as far as scientific-research word is concerned, then this had to continue. The reason they gave for this was that it made no difference -- research work could not be banned because it could not be monitored. Well, the question as to whether you can or cannot monitor it is complex. Of course, if research work is carried out in terms of the preparation of the relevant papers, inside premises, then, evidently, it will not be so easy to monitor it. But it frequently happens that next to the laboratory is some kind of testing ground, used for the appropriate purposes.

But even assuming that it is altogether difficult to monitor this, one is prompted to ask: Why carry out such work -- even if one calls it research or scientific-research work -- while an understanding exists that one should steer matters toward the full and definitive destruction of nuclear weapons? Why, one asks oneself, should scientific-research work be carried out in order to create a whole system of new types of armaments to be deployed in space? Thus, this position of the American Administration, a position in favor of holding scientific-research work, is a weak and vulnerable position. Why make -- even in the first phase -- why make preparations for subsequently testing and deploying a new type of armaments? And who, one might ask, could give a guarantee that after the completion of scientific-research work, a halt would be called? Surely it is possible there will be people, both scientists and nonscientists, who will say: Excuse us, but we have spent so many billions of dollars on scientific-research work, why should this amount of money be lost?

[Matveyev] $26 billion!

[Gromyko] They will say: Is it not better to use it, and to move on to the next stage, of which everyone now disapproves and on which it has been agreed that they -- that is, the testing and deployment -- must be banned? Is such a situation possible? Yes it is.

We know the handwriting of the U.S. Administration, and we know the situation in the United States. Thus the position -- this I want to stress with all possible determination -- in a political and moral sense, on the conduct of scientific-research work which aims to create a large-scale missile defense system, does not withstand criticism; it is vulnerable; and it must be rejected. You know, if one were to say it frankly, then, from such a position to the absurd, there is a very small distance.

[Bogachev] Allow me to ask a question on control. The U.S. side not infrequently claims that the Soviet Union underestimates the importance of the problem of monitoring, the monitoring of the observance of agreements. Sometimes one can even hear that the Soviet Union supposedly violates the pledges it has undertaken. What would you say to this question?

[Gromyko] Yes indeed, the U.S. side has long been using this argument, one may say, from the very beginning of the examination of the issues of disarmament after the end of World War II. But I would reply in this way: that not a single state has submitted a more radical or a more far-reaching proposal on the issues of control than the Soviet Union, the Soviet state, has. With the appearance of nuclear weapons, when this question on monitoring arose, we submitted under the aegis of the United Nations Organization a proposal to ban these weapons once and for all.

We were told: What about monitoring? And what about other types of weapons? Our reply was simple -- let us raise the question of other types of weapons as well, and let us come to an agreement on monitoring. On what monitoring? On the widest, most comprehensive monitoring, the deepest monitoring -- in a word on universal monitoring. We submitted this proposal; no other state did. Our friends fully supported this, our joint proposal; and we insisted in the course of many years on the adoption of a proposal on universal disarmament under universal control.

Do you think the West and the United States went for this? No, they did not go for this. They did not go for either universal disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons, nor did they go for universal monitoring. This proposal currently lies on the table of the U.S. Administration and of other governments of the NATO bloc, and in general, other governments in the world. We are still prepared today to consider such a broad proposal, a proposal envisaging universal and total disarmament, under universal and total international monitoring -- international, I stress. This means that American representatives, too, can take part in this supervision. And as for all these insinuations that the Soviet Union supposedly does not fulfill certain obligations in a signed agreement on verification, on monitoring, they are fabrications.

Note that these memoranda and notes, which are sent by the U.S. Administration to Congress and are sometimes brought to the attention of the United Nations, to the effect that such actions, which I mentioned, supposedly take place on the part of the Soviet Union. They contain expressions like these: There are doubts about whether the Soviet Union is fulfilling some obligations or other; or it appears that some obligations or other are not being fully carried out; or the question arises of verifying whether such-and-such obligations are really being fulfilled by the Soviet Union. But nowhere are there direct statements with proof, using facts, that the Soviet Union is actually violating anything. We deny this categorically. No! The Soviet Union is not accustomed to violating its obligations that are in accordance with treaties and agreements under which its signature and the signature of other states stand, whether it is a bilateral or a multilateral agreement. We are proud of this.

And, by the way, the world has grown accustomed to this; it is accustomed to it. When the Americans declare that supposedly not all is in order with the Soviet Union's fulfillment of provisions on verification of some agreement or other this, you know, is listened to with some indifference; and other states have never made statements to us to the effect that there is actually confirmation of this. No, no.

Our conscience is clear here. We do not conclude agreements in order not to fulfill them. We fulfill these agreements in every aspect, from start to finish.

[Shukov] Official U.S. representatives hint that they intend to hold serious negotiations only about nuclear arms, whereas as far as space weapons are concerned, here the American side supposedly intends merely to explain the meaning of these sytems for the consolidation of peace. How do you assess such statements?

[Gromyko] You know, if there are such free interpretations of the American position in connection with the accord that was achieved in Geneva, then they do not express the spirit of that accord, if the statement is understood as any reasonable person must understand it. It is directly stated there that it is a question of negotiations which will embrace such-and-such and such-and-such and such-and-such spheres: space strategic nuclear arms, and intermediate-range nuclear arms.

And if someone has a situation in mind whereby in the discussion of the space issue one side would merely carry out the exercise of elucidating its own position, not corresponding to the spirit of the accord, while the other side would listen, then they are off the track. We do not envisage that kind of seminar. That is a pointless exercise. It would be an emply exercise.

Without accord, a simultaneous and mutually linked accord on all three aspects, no progress can be made towards fulfilling what was agreed upon in Geneva. One would wish rather that there might be fewer such statements of a frivolous nature by the United States, and best of all, none at all. A serious approach to these matters is required. They brook no such liberties.

[Matveyev] What prospects in the area of reducing strategic armaments would be opened up in the event of an accord being reached on preventing the militarization of outer space?

[Gromyko] Yes, I have to say that more favorable prospects would be opened up than to date. I have already said that it is impossible to examine a ban on strategic armaments excluding space. But if the problems of space were examined in the necessary direction and if accords in this area became clear, then it would be possible to move forward also on questions of strategic armaments. The Soviet Union would be willing not only to examine this problem of stregic armaments but would also be willing to reduce them sharply, upholding of course the principle of equality, of identical security, but to reduce strategic armaments. That kind of possibility would be opened up. And on the contrary, if there were no movement forward in space questions, then it would be superfluous even to speak about the possibility of a reduction in strategic armaments.

[Bogachev] Andrey Andreyevich, are the agreements previously reached on strategic armaments working?

[Gromyko] This question does arise. Concerning the SALT I Treaty, which was concluded when Mr Nixon was the U.S. President, despite the fact that the period of validity for the treaty expired, in due time the sides agreed to exchange official statements to the effect that the obligations assumed by the sides under this treaty remained in force. I therefore may reply that they remain in force today. We are prepared to regard this treaty as such in future.

Concerning the second treaty, SALT II, which was duly signed in Vienna on our side by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and on the U.S. side by former President Carter: This treaty, as is known, was not ratified by the United States. The obligations assumed by the sides under this treaty therefore are not legally in order and do not remain valid.

[Gromyko] But the sides reached an agreement that whatever is of positive significance should, in fact, operate in this agreement, too. Why such a formula? Because the contents of this agreement are complicated in many respects, in particular in the respect that some of the points of the agreement -- and this is someting that should be clear -- for instance those on cruise missiles, no longer apply. This was a temporary factor -- these points no longer apply and are no longer operating. There was a protocol as an addendum to the accord. It does not exist any more. That is why it is correct to say that what is positive now in connection with this accord should be in operation. There is an understanding between the two sides here and this is good.

[Zorin] The U.S. Administration stresses emphatically and emphasizes the fact that the presence in the Soviet Union of heavy intercontinental ballistic missiles is a destabilizing influence and consequently insists that these systems be sharply reduced. In your view are there grounds for presenting the issue in this manner?

[Gromyko] No, there are absolutely no grounds for presenting the issue in this way. When at one time negotiations on strategic weapons were being conducted, our so-called heavy missiles, which Washington particularly dislikes at the moment, represented a component part of the accord -- I repeat, a component part of the accord. At that time we made allowances on issues of forward-based U.S. systems, including those in Europe. We did not involve in this treaty U.S. bases in Europe, although we announced that this issue should be settled in subsequent negotiations. But as far as SALT II is concerned, this issue was not involved in it. In return, the United States deemed it justified for the Soviet Union to have these heavy missiles, the missiles about which so much is being said at times and such a fuss is made of in the United States. So the Soviet Union has remained and remains also in this matter a supporter of the principle of equality and equal security.

Moreover, we have drawn the attention of the American Administration to the fact -- although, generally speaking, there are thinking people over there. It itself also understands that the history of the formation of strategic armaments in the USSR and in the United States is such that these armaments have taken shape differently. The United States has always had a powerful Air Force, a bomber Air Force. We have in mind first of all aircraft as delivery vehicles of nuclear weapons. Such a factor as submarines also worked in that direction. Therefore, to take and eliminate this difference in one stroke, including in the structure of the strategic nuclear forces, is not serious. And it looks as if, in the end, even official American circles have started to understand that their demand, which they previously stressed in every possible way in connection with our heavy missiles, is excessive and, in short, inappropriate. And ever more frequently they have started to say: Yes, indeed, the history of how strategic nuclear forces have taken shape in both countries, needs to be accepted here.

We have not given up and are not giving up the sacrosanct point which needs to be accepted in talks on nuclear armaments: the principle of equality and equal security. This is how it was before; this is how it is today, and this is also how it will be in the future. That is the only healthy, convincing basis by whose observance the accords and positive solutions of questions of nuclear armaments, questions of space, questions of intermediate-range weapons can be sought. I hope that I have answered your question.

[Zhukov] Incidentally, on medium-range nuclear weapons, what will the situation be if the Americans continue with the deployment of their new nuclear missiles in Europe during the time of the talks?

[Gromyko] If the United States continues to deploy its medium-range weapons in Europe, then I must say bluntly that the situation will be made more complicated, and greatly more complicated. The fact that we proposed a freeze on these weapons is well known. Indeed, in Geneva we warned the United States quite clearly that if it did so -- if it continued with the deployment; and it was at great pains to emphasize that it had plans, and that it intended to carry out those plans -- then it would put in question the talks that were due to begin in accordance with the understanding reached in Geneva. I repeat -- we warned the United States about this. We hope that it will bear this in mind.

[Matveyev] Now, tell us, please, have Washington and the U.S. allies as well reviewed their attitude on the question of counting the nuclear weapons of Britain and France in tackling the question of medium-range nuclear armaments?

[Gromyko] From what we have heard from U.S. representatives in Geneva and elsewhere, you know, American statesmen come out virtually every day with statements, commenting on first one side, then the other, on nuclear armaments, the situation in general, East-West relations, and relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and it appears that they have not shifted their position on the question of British and French armaments. We have answered them, are answering, and will continue to answer them by saying that British and French armaments must be taken into account. Britain and France are members of the North Atlantic alliance. It would be most unjustified if the North Atlantic alliance obtained a kind of addition, or a bonus if you like, in the form of the British and French armaments. This is the crux of the disagreement between us, and this is a basic disagreement in connection with the discussion of the medium-range weapons problem.

We made proposals as to the basis on which an understanding could be reached between the Soviet Union and the United States. We declared on repeated occasions that we do not, all told, put matters in the following way: Britain and France must scrap their weapons. What we say is that they must defend themselves. This means that if British and French weapons remain at their disposal, then American weapons must be reduced by the corresponding number. This is, so to speak, one campaign -- a campaign taking place on one side of the barricade, figuratively speaking.

[Bogachev] You have already mentioned the problem of airborne nuclear armaments. Another question that arises is whether the Soviet position presupposes taking into account in the overall balance of forces medium-range nuclear weapons carried by ship-borne aircraft, aircraft which carry nuclear weapons and are based on aircraft carriers, in the European zone?

[Gromyko] This is actually an exceptionally important question. Up to now, during the talks we have held, we have taken six American aircraft carriers into account -- aircraft carriers which, by and large, either frequent European waters, for instance the Mediterranean, or which are found near European waters. There are, I repeat, six such carriers. Altogether, and this, at the end of the day, is a well-known fact, the United States has 14 aircraft carriers; and a 15th is being built -- by all accounts its construction is nearing completion, or at any rate completion is not far away. Each of these aircraft carriers has 40 aircraft which carry nuclear weapons. Each aircraft has two or three nuclear warheads. Just look: If you take a mere 6, a mere 6, then you end up with 480 nuclear warheads. But they number 15 in all: Surely it is not complicated or difficult in some kind of extreme situation to bring aircraft carriers closer to Europe from other parts of the world? No, not particularly difficult.

So what we have in mind is that a certain stage in the talks, we can raise the question not just of the 6, but of the 15 aircraft carriers. That is, we will include those which we have not counted hitherto.

Even if you take a mere 6 aircraft carriers and assume that each aircraft has just 2 nuclear warheads, then, as I have already said, you get 480. But if you take twice that number of nuclear-capable aircraft, that is aircraft as carriers carrying nuclear weapons, and twice as many nuclear warheads, then this is more than 1,000 nuclear warheads. [sentence as heard] This is a colossal force, a colossal force. We intend to keep this in reserve.

If the talks go in such a way that the use of this factor is justified, we shall do that; we have a right to do so. It is not a luxury but it is a necessity. I have attempted to give you the mathematical justification of such a formulation of the issue.

The Americans know this, although, sometimes, evidently regarding it as the height of subtle tactics, do not speak in this spirit, forgetting about this issue, as it were, and putting it to one side.

[Zorin] There is another aspect to the question. It is sometimes said in the West nowadays that the talks on which an accord has been reached in Geneva are merely a resumption of the talks which were interrupted earlier, and that they are taking place allegedly because the new American missiles are being deployed in Europe. How would you comment on assertions of this kind?

[Gromyko] Of course, this is not a resumption of the talks. They are completely new talks. The Americans, and the U.S. secretary of state personally, have also agreed that these are new talks, not a resumption of the old talks. And since they were at first trying to use expressions, trying to slip them in as it were, about talks having been resumed, when we explained that it would be closer to the truth, they agreed that the talks are of course completely new. And the way the issues are put is completely different than how it was previously during these talks; the way the issue is put has to be quite different.

What mainly should be stressed here? It mainly has to be stressed here that if before talks were conducted separately on strategic weapons and on medium-range weapons, and both sides agreed that it was proper to conduct the matter in that way, and that it might be easier to find agreement that way, then now it has definitely become clear that it is not in fact possible to hold talks on strategic weapons and to try to reach agreement without resolving the issue of medium-range weapons. It is not possible. Why is it not possible? Because for the Soviet Union, medium-range weapons are also strategic weapons. Medium-range weapons are such only according to the parameters of their range; but in effect, and of course in power, in effect they are strategic weapons for the Soviet Union. Why? Because they can reach the Soviet Union's territory. They can reach the Soviet Union's territory, while the type of weapon which is opposed all the time, day and night, by the United States and its allies, our SS-20 missiles, medium-range weapons, none of them can reach the territory of the United States. That is one of the arguments in favor of there now having to be an integrated approach, an integrated approach to resolving the problems.

The issue of strategic nuclear weapons cannot be examined in isolation from that of space. Also, the issue of medium-range nuclear weapons cannot be examined in isolation from that of space. The issue of strategic weapons cannot be examined as separate from medium-range weapons. It is essential to examine these only in combination, not to mention the fact that, lumped together, weapons, strategic medium-range weapons, cannot be examined separately from weapons in space. That is the reason why we have come to the negotiations, to the talks of a preliminary nature, to the talks with the United States, in order to tell the truth: this is the situation today, this is the situation that has arisen today. All these problems can only be examined together. If the United States, or, more precisely, the U.S. Administration, did not have any plans to create a so-called large-scale missile defense, then the question would not arise in involving space and examining it all together -- space must be clean.

The arms race must not spread there. On this count there are appropriate statements, or if you prefer, accords with the participation of the United States, but, after all, this position is different. So that, at the moment, these two problems of strategic armaments and medium-range weapons can only be examined jointly. But the most important thing that it is essential to bear in mind here is that all this is a single complex [kompleks]. This is being done, you see, not because on paper it is easier to operate with three complexes, to draw up some kind of results, to search for points of some kind which do not coincide. No, life itself forces one, the real situation forces one, to approach the matter as a complex. In the final analysis, people are indifferent as to how they die, whether from a bomb coming from space, or a bomb launched by a strategic missile or by a medium-range missile. But it is possible to solve the first, the second, and the third. I am talking here about a correct approach -- a desire and will to reach an agreement.

[Matveyev] But what about the security interests of our allies at forthcoming talks, of the fraternal socialist countries? How will they be taken into account?

[Gromyko] We will fully take them into account, fully take them into account. We conducted the talks both in our own name -- the Soviet Union speaks to Western countries and to the United States in its own name and in the name of its allies. Our principled policy is a united one, and this gives strength to our policy. Periodically we discuss these issues at conferences of the Political Consultative Committee and other Warsaw Treaty bodies, and we reach agreement. This is a joint policy. And so we are speaking both for ourselves and for them, and we consider that their security interests must also be fully protected in the same way as the Soviet Union's interests should also be protected.

[Zhukov] I would like to return to the space issue. Let us assume that the United States, bearing in mind its past behavior, were to embark upon violating the accords reached in the area concerning the need to avert the space arms race. What would be the consequences of such a situation?

[Gromyko] The consequences would be very grave indeed, very grave indeed. If it were to embark upon this, the talks would be wrecked. We gave this warning to the American representatives. There is no choice here, and no intermediate course. One either deals with space seriously -- preventing an arms race in space and keeping it unmilitarized -- or there is an arms race. A half measure here does not solve the issue. A half measure, perhaps a half measure today, could lead tomorrow to an intensification of the arms race, so that space becomes a terrible and threatening arena for deploying the appropriate types of weapons, and becomes a great danger for humanity, for the very existence of humanity. This is not churning out cliches, not at all. When people talk about so-called star wars, and about a broad-scale missile defense system, they are talking about life and death. This is how the question stands. We consider it our duty to tell the truth not only to the United States but to the world. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko has spoken of this more than once in his statements and appeals to the American President, when he drew attention to the need to prevent competition in the deployment of weapons in space.

On this question, the question of space, we will fight to the end. Irrespective of what strong words one uses in connection with this, they will still not be sufficient to express the whole of the danger which would be attendant upon deployment of arms in space and upon the spread of the arms race to space.

[Bogachev] Andrey Andreyevich, which side put forward the proposal regarding the structure of the forthcoming talks?

[Gromyko] It was we who put it forward, it was the Soviet side that put this proposal forward. And it is a logical one. This is what we argued -- and it is this that the Central Committee and the Politburo were guided by -- since it is essential to examine the problems in space and the problems of strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear arms jointly, then it is also logical to build the structure of the talks in such a way that they should accord with each other. That is why we suggested that each side should field a single delegation, although it should naturally include three groups, so that one group can deal with the questions of space, the second with strategic nuclear arms and the third one with medium-range nuclear arms. We explained in detail what content this structure should contain: Each group would deal with its own field, should deal with its own field.

However, questions which will also be of interest to another group will arise, will inevitably arise -- questions which are connected with those under examination in the other group and in the third group. I have already spoken about it. That is why, a single delegation should, in this case, examine the situation in its full composition, and see how various questions relate to each other, so that a situation does not arise here in which an accord begins to take shape in one group independently of the second and of the third.

I have already spoken about space and the inconceivability of excluding space from any accord on other issues. This is obligatory. We do not lay down any strict rules regarding after what time the delegation should meet in full complement to examine these issues: This is presently impossible to foresee. The progress of negotiations will dictate the need for the appropriate procedure. There should thus be a combination both of in-depth examination by separate groups of issues in the appropriate spheres, and of all issues from the point of view of their combination. Three directions means a mass of diverse components. There are not just pluses here, for the more components there are, the more possibilities there are of exchanging and adapting them in various ways. There are difficulties, too, and both the one and the other must be taken into account. There is no other way out.

And altogether, we should not be frightened of this structural complexity -- if the desire and will are there, one can find them, for all this can be calculated. Furthermore, without any particular difficulty it can be mathematically counted up, adjusted, and made equivalent. The possibility exists. We have people, masses of people, who have a good grasp of the factual material, who have resources at their fingertips, as they say. There will be no holdup over that. Will and desire, that is what is needed.

[Zorin] Andrey Andreyevich, it is hard to make predictions, of course, but I should nevertheless like to ask you the following question: What can you say about the future of negotiations -- to the extent, of course, to which one can judge matters at present, before the negotiations have started?

[Gromyko] In my opinion, this is a very hard question to answer, if a precise answer is what is wanted. I think you could ask 100 wise men, and they would not be able to give you a precise answer. I can speak only for the Soviet side.

We hope that the negotiations will be businesslike, that the approach will be serious, that those goals which were marked out in Geneva will really be sustained, that the two sides will not resort to cunning, and that neither of them will try to lead the other astray and try to gain some kind of advantage in violation of the principle of equality and equal security.

It is not easy to do that now. Each side must proceed from the fact that the other side will not allow deviation from this principle. We are in favor of achieving peace, a mutually acceptable solution, and the preparation of appropriate agreements: this applies both to space, to strategic arms, and to medium-range weapons. I have turned your question around just a little, but I think it needed to be turned around, and I have tried to give an answer.

[Zhukov] Are there some other issues related to nuclear arms which, though they will not be the subject of talks just now, could even now be resolved independently?

[Gromyko] Yes, there are such issues. We have stated them to the American side, and even cited such issues. Without giving an exhaustive list of them, for example, there is the possibility, irrespective of the state of affairs in all these three fields, to conclude an agreement on stopping nuclear weapons testing. Why should this not be solved? It can be. There are no objective obstacles to agreement and to drawing up these accords and agreements. We have proposed this, propose it now, and will propose it again. Then, there is the question of freezing nuclear arsenals. This issue can be singled out. We are in favor of resolving it, the sooner the better, irrespective of the state of play in any of the three fields we have been speaking about all the time.

A third example: We consider that the agreements signed between the Soviet Union and the United States several years ago concerning explosions for peaceful purposes and the threshold agreement on nuclear weapons tests, could be put into effect. There has simply been obstructionism on this on the part of the United States. It deliberately and demonstratively failed to bring this to a conclusion. It could be done.

There are also several other similar spheres which could be resolved without particular difficulty, we are convinced, without setting conditions in the spheres of which I have spoken. I would class the issue of a pledge by the nuclear powers not to be first to use nuclear weapons among such issues. Any nuclear country could, and in our opinion should, adopt such a pledge at any time -- today, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow. The Soviet Union has adopted such a pledge, and you know that the whole world applauded it.

[Bogachev] The Soviet Union is now starting new talks with the United States. But where is the guarantee that it will not again use them as a screen, as cover for its plans to attain military superiority? Where is the guarantee that it will not lead them into a dead end again?

[Gromyko] Well, I do not know who could guarantee that the stance of the United States will always be decent and constructive. After all, we know what it had in mind in the past. I have cited several examples where agreements that were concluded were refuted or declared invalid. And so I would not like to work in such conditions. But we clearly know that in the interests of peace, in the interests of the United States, of the Soviet Union and of the whole world, everything possible has to be done in order for things to go along the right road, for accords to be implemented, and for agreements to be reached which have to be reached, for those issues which need resolving, which must be resolved, to be resolved. That is something one can say with confidence.

I would like, on my own initiative and proceeding from the spirit of your questions -- the direct question has not yet been asked, perhaps you have it in mind, so to speak -- to highlight one important question.

It should be more properly understood among our people, and among those abroad who are interested in these problems, and by foreign public opinion, that the American side describes its plan regarding outer space -- the plan of so-called large-scale missile defense -- as a defensive one. And they maintained frequently to us in Geneva, especially at the start of the talks: why, they say, do you object to this plan? After all, it's a defensive plan. We, they say, want to create weapons that can knock out missiles launched against the United States. So that is defense! Therein lies a pretty crafty and artful trick. Imagine that they managed to create such a system, or something like it. I mean the United States, or more precisely, the U.S. Administration. In other words, they create a shield to protect them from missiles. For they are saying that they fear a nuclear strike from the Soviet Union; therefore they need a shield. Suppose they create a shield -- they are saying that this shield is of a peace-loving nature- It is designed to destroy the other side's missiles, so that these missiles do not reach their target. So this is what they mean by a shield -- one directed against the other side, against the Soviet Union. But this, of course, would be in an extreme situation. But from their point of view, what's all this? There's no danger here for the United States, and they even try to convince us that there is no danger to us either.

We are told this: After all, the United States does not have the intention of striking a blow at the Soviet Union. We tell them: Well, then, it follows that the Soviet Union must rely on your conscience, on the conscience of Washington. Well, first of all, we are not very convinced that Washington has very great reserves of this merchandise; we do not have that conviction, bearing in mind certain facts. And second, if we were to mentally trade places with you, the United States of America, then it follows that you must think the same way as we, the Soviet Union, do. In other words, would our corresponding statements then, if we were trying to create such a system, corresponding statements, statements to the effect that: You should rely on our conscience. Would they be sufficient for you? Silence. Silence. Therefore the fact that the U.S. Administration has christened this plan as defensive, or the word 'system' is more to the liking, a defensive system -- large-scale, defensive -- does not change anything. Some social strata do get misled, one must say frankly, but of course, there is absolutely nothing defensive here. These weapons are offensive, and this whole plan, to speak frankly, this plan is aggressive, aggressive. We are resolutely against it; resolutely. It seems to us that everyone who tries to take up an honest position in these questions should realize what aim is being pursued by this plan.

Let us assume even from the point of view of theoretical analysis, let us assume even that the United States, well, does not use, well, has created this system and does not use its capabilities for launching missiles against the Soviet Union and striking a nuclear blow and also that this is so from the start, but it would have the ability to do so. If it had a protective shield, if it had this, would this really not be used for pressure, for blackmail? Of course it would. This fits in with the policy which aims to obtain domination or a dominating position in the world, such a position as would enable the United States of America to dictate its conditions, in this case to the Soviet Union. We decisively reject this entire system, this entire plan, and I wish to reemphasize that equality, equality, equality and equal security is the granite basis for conducting matters also in future. There is no other position.

If there are poeple in the United States who assume that somehow or other the United States will achieve a dominating position with the bringing to completion of its plan to set up this system or without bringing it to completion, and the Soviet Union will be in a subordinate position, this is an error, this is a gross error.

This must not occur! I want to take this opportunity to stress once again what Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko has said in his statements and what he has written personally to Reagan, the American President -- that such a position is ruled out. We will not allow that. We have colossal resources, both material and intellectual, sufficient to enable us to secure our position, and this applies to the Soviet Union and our allies and friends. Our people found within themselves the source whereby they emerged victorious from a war against German fascism unprecedented in the scale of its destructiveness. The whole world was amazed at the way in which this took place, for our people bore upon their shoulders the main burdern of the war. Putting it figuratively, our people, in the political sense, gave out nuclear energy, and emerged the victors. They will never allow any country or group of countries guided by ideological considerations to dictate its condition to them at any time. The fact that American plans are permeated by these ideological considerations to a considerable extent, this is beyond doubt and, I think, understood by every Soviet person and by others, too.

[Matveyev] Andrey Andreyevich, if you will allow me, a question from another area: The world public, and the Soviet public, of course, are worried by the tension that is being maintained in the Caribbean Basin region. What could you say about this?

[Gromyko] I shall merely say, in brief, that we had an opportunity to bring the Soviet leadership's point of view to the attention of the U.S. Administration. We resolutely condemn its actions. The policy of the United States is a policy of crude, unconcealed interference in the internal affairs of the Caribbean Basin countries. This applies, first and foremost, to Nicaragua. The United States has absolutely no right to dictate to this small country and its people what social system it should choose and what conditions they should live in. This is the sovereign right of the people and only the people of Nicaragua. General elections were held there recently and the supreme state leadership was elected. The results were further confirmation of the degree of hostility and hatred which has built up in the Nicaraguan people against the servants of the United States that used to rule that country. They are no longer there. The people have started breathing freely. What they need now is to be left in peace. The interference and the covert and overt terrorism being carried out against that country by the United States and its various services must be stopped. And, of course, we also condemn the policy the United States has been pursuing with regard to Cuba for a long time. Here one has in mind the economic blockade and various other unfriendly and hostile, even, acts. The Cubans -- and only the Cubans -- have the right to determine the conditions of life in their country and to decide which system should operate in that country. Nobody has the right to interfere. In general, if you take that region and, indeed, if you even go beyond the bounds of that region, it is time -- it has long been time for the United States to stop its interference in the internal affairs of other states in all areas; to stop political interference, economic interference, and intelligence operations by various special bodies which, by all accounts, are not halting for a single day criminal work against a number of states.

I would like to ask one question of myself, if I may put it that way. I do not know whether you intended to ask it of me or not. But we have a procedure whereby this form of questioning can also be used. Admittedly, it does not happen very often that speakers in this kind of discussion ask themselves questions. What assessment can one make of the current situation in the world? What direction are things taking? Is it towards peace, or towards war? Let me say in advance that you shouldn't expect a mathematically precise answer. Nevertheless, it is possible to say a few things. The situation now is very complicated, and at times dangerous.

Unexpected things may happen, too. It is necessary to be always on alert. Our people are always on alert. But this is what must be stressed: It must be stressed that there is determination on the part of our country, our entire people, the Leninist Communist Party, our leadership, the Politburo, and Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko has spoken clearly about this many times. There is determination to do everything possible in defending the cause of peace. This is the goal we are working toward. This is the aim for which we mobilize our people, our resources. This is what we say to our friends who share the same principles, and this is what we also say to other countries and various circles abroad: What is necessary for even more successful work for the cause of removing the threat of war and strengthening peace? It is necessary that all states, both big and small, should work in the same direction, and even more actively in the direction of removing the threat of war and strengthening peace. Not a single state, even a small state, should remain a bystander. Not a single state should think that there are major powers that have large resources, so let them carry on the struggle, it depends on them first of all. Some of this is correct, and some is not. It is true that it depends on them first of all, but it is not true that they are alone in this struggle. All states must carry on the struggle for peace, both big and small, and even the smallest. A state may be small, but that does not mean it cannot speak out the big truth, and speak in a loud voice in favor of peace and in condemnation of war, especially if the small states would act in the same direction and cohesively.

This relates to public circles, to parties, first and foremost, those which oppose war on the positions of peace. They must step up their work; this relates to scientific figures, to cultural figures, to business figures, if one is to speak of the capitalist countries. They must also understand what war is, and to what consequences it would lead. This relates to the workers, the peasants, the intelligentsia, whatever countries they may be in. We are convinced of the fact that the forces advocating peace are more powerful than the forces advocating war and the arms race.

[Zorin] At the recent UN General Assembly session, all the states of the world voted for the resolution to use deep space exclusively for peaceful purposes; only the United States abstained. The session adopted a number of other important decisions in favor of curbing the arms race and reducing the risk of war. How do you assess the results of the session as a whole?

[Gromyko] We assess the results of the last session very positively. We submitted a number of proposals for the session's examination, including proposals relating to the inadmissibility of the militarization of space. We welcomed with enormous pleasure the fact that the overwhelming majority of states supported our proposal; actually, only the United States was against it, and it demonstrated this by its vote. Thus, our assessment of the results of the session is most positive. In general, it must be said here — taking this opportunity — that in the course of a number of years, a number of years, the majority of the world's states, even those states which, on a state-to-state level, do not have such cordial relations with us, have been instinctively, I repeat, instinctively inclined to support those proposals which contribute to the cause of averting war and the strengthening of peace. This is a very good phenomenon, it is not liked by some countries that carry out the opposite policy.

Well, what can we say about this? One would like to express the hope that those countries will consider the opinion and position of the overwhelming majority of world states, and of all peoples of the world. There is justification for saying that the American people, too, do not want war.

[Zhukov] Andrey Andreyevich, how do you appraise the role of the mass antiwar movements in the struggle for preventing the arms race?

[Gromyko] The role of these mass movements is very important. Lately one has been able to hear this sort of statement from time to time: You see, you -- the Soviet Union -- relied on mass antiwar movements, but nevertheless they did not prevent, say, the deployment of American missiles in West Europe, nor did they prevent such-and-such measures from being taken. This reasoning is very strange. This movement, although it has not embraced all peoples, it nevertheless an advanced trend, and it has demonstrated that people despise those who work for the cause of war; they despise those who vote for military allocations; they despise and denounce all those who work for an increase in missile arsenals and nuclear arms arsenals; they denounce and despise those who vote in legislative bodies for further militarization of policy and for the arms race. It should be assumed that the movement has far from used its potential. We assume that it has not yet spoken its last word. And it is a good thing that the idea is penetrating more and more into public opinion and the masses, the masses of people, that the world is living through an exceptional time, that a great danger, a great threat hangs over the head of all mankind, and everything must be done to remove this threat, that the Armageddon, which for centuries has frightened people, should not happen.

[Matveyev] It is well know that in past years in Soviet-U.S. relations quite a few agreements were concluded between our country and the United States concerning the development of cooperation in bilateral spheres. What is the state of affairs now?

[Gromyko] In brief, the state of affairs is not satisfactory. A number of agreements -- in general, one can say that more than 10 agreements were concluded. In their time, life was breathed into them, and they began to make themselves felt. On the basis of these agreements, our delegations went to the United States, and American delegations came to the Soviet Union, agreement was reached on some issues, and something was achieved to the benefit of both countries. Then these agreements were either formally canceled, or ceased to be effective in practice, since the U.S. Administration -- this is in recent years -- decided that these agreements should not be operative; and should cease to be effective. We have asked questions in Washington: Well, do you intend to leave these agreements in a state of freeze, or do you have some other intentions? In our opinion, the present situation is damaging both for you and for us. Would it not be better for them to be operative? Following some reflection, the way they responded to us was that, yes, certain agreements really should probably be revived with a view to making them operative; but some agreements would still need looking at. They have talked this way once, twice and, I would add, three times, but so far there has been no real movement. The agreements are paralyzed for the time being, with a very minor exception, a very minor exception.

[Bogachev] It has been announced that the forthcoming talks, like all other efforts to limit and reduce arms, have the final aim of eliminating the nuclear potentials of all countries, everywhere and completely. What important does our country attach to the resolution of this task?

[Gromyko] Exceptional importance. I must say that the point about one of the chief aims of both powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, being elimination, total elimination of nuclear weapons from their arsenals, is a very important accord. It is included in the joint statement. Previously nothing was said in joint Soviet-U.S. statements about this.

And we consider that practical actions and the settling of the space question should not contradict that aim. The aim is a great and noble one. And it is not only now that we are setting it. We set this aim immediately after atomic weapons emerged.

We submitted a corresponding proposal to the United Nations in 1946. At that time, however, it met with no support, primarily from the United States. This is an important point. What is necessary is simply that every step by the two powers -- the two powers, not just the Soviet Union but the United States as well -- in matters of armament and disarmament should, in these matters, bring nearer this goal -- that of the exclusion, the full exclusion of nuclear weapons from arsenals.

[Zorin] Andrey Andreyevich, in what measure would the reaching of mutually-acceptable accords at the forthcoming negotiations be able to help improve Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole, and also help to generally improve the international situation?

[Gromyko] In what measure? That would assuredly improve Soviet-U.S. relations in very great measure, or what are called Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations. This follows from the very fact that the chief contradiction and the chief barrier that separates the policy of the Soviet Union from that of the United States is atomic weapons. It is the issue which relates to this problem. It is the issue about the principle of equality and identical security. It is the issue about the spheres of the arms race or the spheres in which the arms race is to be ended.

An accord on these problems would therefore undoubtedly denote a big step forward in matters relating to improving bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations, especially if one takes account of the fact that both sides are major powers with broad-ranging international interests. I think this should be clear.

[Zorin] Andrey Andreyevich, allow us to thank you both for finding the opportunity for this conversation, and for the very interesting and detailed replies to our questions. There were perhaps a lot of them, but we tried to encompass what is currently of interest to all. Thank you very much.

[Gromyko] Thank you.

LOMEYKO ON PROSPECTS FOR SOVIET-U.S. ARMS TALKS

LD111848 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Vladimir Lomeyko, the chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Department, gave an interview to Stefan Babiak, our permanent Moscow correspondent. In reply to the question: What are the prospects for Soviet-American talks following the Geneva meeting of the two countries' ministers of foreign affairs, he said:

[Begin Lomeyko recording in Russian fading into Czech translation] I think that it is too early to say, as some American journalists have, that the Geneva meeting means a turn or the beginning of a new era in Soviet-American relations. In my opinion, we have to choose a more sober tone. No doubt it is an important moment because the agreement about the new talks touches upon a whole complex of vitally important questions that have appeared on the horizon on which depend peace, international stability, the continuation or, on the contrary, the limitation of the arms race, above all nuclear, but also space. Our future and the future of our children is linked with solution of these questions.

The fact that in the framework of long-demanding discussions a unity of opinions on the determination of topics and goals of new talks was achieved in Geneva, and furthermore, in a very concrete form, which was not the case in the past, is no doubt an important success. Today, however, we can only talk about the first step -- the meeting was only the beginning. The future depends on the talks themselves. The Soviet Union has always called for the limitation of the arms race until the complete liquidation of nuclear arms. The united voice of the entire Soviet country can be heard from Moscow in this sense today as well. At the same time, at least two voices can be heard in Washington. They call themselves the hawks and doves. This clearly shows that the struggle of different approaches in the United States is continuing and that the most (?aggressive) American circles have not put down their arms. These forces stood in opposition to the agreements before Geneva, and in the course of the meeting their supporters continued in the same spirit. Despite this, a realistic line has won, and this is an important aspect of the Geneva meeting.

The most decisive fact still remains: how the talks themselves will develop and how their development can be reflected in the sphere of the key problems of Soviet-American relations.

In brief, the more successful and more fruitful the talks, the more positive will be their influence on the whole broad sphere of Soviet-American contacts, and here it will also be beneficial for the development of relations between East and West and the situation in the world as a whole because the international atmosphere as a whole in many respects depends on the climate of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. [end recording]

[Presenter] To the question: What are the obstacles in these talks, and can they be overcome, Comrade Lomeyko said:

[Begin Lomeyko recording in Russian fading into Czech translation] The Geneva talks were themselves complicated, and the follow-up talks, which will span the whole range of variations in all the issues under discussion, will be equally complicated. In addition, the complex of nuclear and space weapons will be assessed in their mutual correlation to one another. The aim of the talks will be to achieve affective accords [umluva] on averting the militarization of space and on stopping the arms race on earth.

In our view, the main problems lies in the fact that the subject of the talks, without any exaggeration, is a gigantic complex of intricately intertwined issues. It is no accident that the talks will be held within the framework of a single delegation, but divided into three groups, because space weapons, strategic forces, and medium-range nuclear weapons represent a sufficiently voluminous package of problems in their own right, and in addition, are mutually interconnected.

I believe, however, that these problems can be overcome if both sides consistently respect the joint statement at Geneva and strive to achieve [dohoda] effective agreements as quickly as possible. [end recording]

PRAVDA CITES U.S. REACTION TO GENEVA TALKS

PM111926 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 85 First Edition p 5

[A. Tolkunov 11 January New York dispatch: "Close Attention"]

[Text] Throughout the past few days, the attention of the mass media, politicians, and experts in the field of nuclear and space strategy here has been focused on Geneva, which is not surprising.

As a television commentator aptly put it: "The public has long been hungry for talks on ending the arms race that offer any hope of progress."

It is no secret to anybody that throughout its first term in office the Republican administration, launching one new nuclear program after another in the United States and deploying Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe in pursuit of the chimera of strategic superiority, deliberately caused the breakdown of the Geneva talks in progress at that time. That was also precisely the time that saw the adoption of the so-called "strategic defense initiative" for the development and creation of various space weapons. However, the growing criticism of this course from not only Americans, but also the U.S. allies and the entire international community, prompted the White House to start talking on the eve of the November presidential elections about its desire to take steps to curb the nuclear arms race and to respond to the Soviet initiative and sit down at the negotiating table.

As a result of the Geneva meeting that ended Tuesday between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, agreement was reached on talks on a package of measures relating to space and nuclear arms -- strategic and medium-range -- with all these questions to be examined and resolved interconnectedly. According to the sides' joint statement, the objective of the upcoming talks will be to formulate effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space, ending the arms race on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability.

On the whole, the reaction to the accord that has been reached is positive, for the very logic of our nuclear age demands that agreements be reached in this field without the slightest delay. The following thought was expressed by Professor (S. Gofman) of Harvard University when commenting on the results of the Geneva meeting: "There must be a future for arms limitation. Otherwise, there will be no future for any of us."

At the same time, restraint in making assessments and predictions can be observed in commentaries, which is understandable. As THE WASHINGTON POST writes in an editorial, "Only the first step on a long and difficult path has been taken." How things go hereafter naturally depends on both sides.

The USSR's consistent and enterprising policy on questions of preventing nuclear war is exerting an increasing influence on the American public. There continues to be widespread comment in the United States on K.U. Chernenko's recent reply to a letter from religious figures. In his reply, THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, the Soviet leader reemphasized his country's readiness and willingness to conduct honest and businesslike talks with the aim of reaching an agreement with the United States on the entire package of questions relating to the nonmilitarization of space and nuclear arms."

In putting forward a series of proposals, former Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director P. Warnke stated, the Soviet Union can be seen to be seriously and earnestly prepared for these talks.

However, the signals from Washington are ambivalent. Delivering his official statement on the results of the Geneva meeting last night, the U.S. President welcomed the accord on talks which, as he stated, must lead to the strengthening of security and the improvement of Soviet-American relations. The U.S. President promised to display "flexibility, patience, and determination" at the talks, and called on Americans to promote the achievement of concrete agreements and lasting peace.

However, the President stated when answering journalists' questions that the United States, while having agreed to talks on space weapons, does not intend to abandon their development. Describing their allegedly "humanitarian objective," he also did not rule out the possibility of deploying these arms in the future.

Noting the inconsistency of the U.S. Administration's position (primarily on the question of space weapons), American commentators are explaining this in terms of many factors. "The differences between the Pentagon hardliners and the State Department pragmatists are as deep as ever," NEW YORK TIMES observer L. Gelb notes. The view that the Soviet Union has gained superiority over the United States in strategic arms remains widespread in the administration. So many American officials intend to demand much greater concessions from Moscow than they are prepared to make themselves." However, the entire history of strategic arms talks shows that deviation from the principle of equality and identical security has deadlocked these talks and frustrated the reaching of agreement. "Despite all the current rhetoric and verbal support for talks," (M. Green), one of the leaders of the Institute of Political Studies, recalls, Washington is contrained by "its ideological straitjacket." It is the Soviet Union that has recently advanced concrete initiatives on curbing the arms race and on the nonmilitarization of space, (M. Green) notes, and "the response and the burden of initiatives now lies with R. Reagan, not the Soviet Union."

Concrete steps to prevent the militarization of space are needed, Federation of American Scientists representative (D. Payk) states. "The development and creation of all weapons of this type must be banned right now," he says. "It will be much more difficult or totally impossible to do it later." This is why, in the view of (K. Rosen), director of the Institute for the Study of Problems of Security and Cooperation in Space, "the Soviet Union imposed a unilateral and verifiable moratorium on the testing of antisatellite weapons and proposed the conclusion of a treaty banning the deployment of any weapons in space. The United States should agree to these proposals."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS SOVIET PEACE INITIATIVES

PM141038 MOSCOW KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jan 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of the Peoples' Security"]

[Text] The latest CPSU Central Committee Politburo session has heard a report from Comrade A.A. Gromyko on his meeting with U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz in Geneva 7-8 January.

It expressed a unanimous opinion regarding the importance of the accord reached at the meeting with respect to the subject matter and goals of the Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear arms, which will be examined and resolved in a package [vo vzaimosvyazi]. Here the Politburo session particularly emphasized that during the forthcoming talks, only the strict observance of the accord reached in all its parts can secure real headway along the path of halting the arms race, eliminating the threat of nuclear war, and ultimately abolishing nuclear weapons. The world's peoples are vitally interested in this.

This is the Soviet Union's principled, constructive approach to the talks. It expects the same from the United States.

The Soviet Union has frequently expressed the conviction that there is no sensible alternative to the constructive development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The USSR and the United States have different social systems and adhere to different world views, but as Comrade K.U. Chernenko noted, "If we constantly bear in mind the responsibility which rests with our two countries, if we direct our policy toward peace, not war, then these differences not only do not rule out, but on the contrary, demand the finding of mutual understanding... For this it is necessary to have a mutual advantage, to the benefit of the cause of peace."

The desire for peace stems from the very nature of socialism. Since the Great October, the land of the soviets has been firmly and consistently steering a course toward peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. One of the young Soviet republic's first decrees was the decree on peace, V.I. Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, stressed: "We now have power, the power of the soviets. This power, promoted by the people themselves, places the great cause of peace for all peoples on fertile soil."

By its practical deeds, the Soviet state has been unswervingly confirming its loyalty to Lenin's peace-loving policy. There is not a single important problem, not a single field connected with international security, on which the Soviet Union has not come out with specific intiatives. They included the practical desire for peace and work for peace, for security not only for the Soviet people, but for all peoples of the world as well.

The Communist Party and Soviet Government invariably focus their main efforts on averting the nuclear danger. Back in 1946, the USSR suggested banning the production and use of atomic weapons in perpetuity and destroying stockpiles of these weapons. Today, the urgency of this task has increased immeasurably.

The USSR is confirming by practical steps its desire to prevent a nuclear catastrophe. It is the Soviet Union that has taken a political step of unrivaled boldness: it has unilaterally pledged to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. The USSR has announced its readiness to put into operation immediately a freeze on all its nuclear weapons if the other nuclear powers do the same. The Soviet proposal on this score remains in force. The Soviet Union will continue to struggle with mounting energy for the curbing of the nuclear arms race. It will seek, on the basis of the principle of parity and identical security, to limit any reduce nuclear arms, right up to their complete liquidation.

The USSR attaches special importance to the problem of preventing the militarization of space. Back in March 1958, the Soviet Government came out with a proposal to ban the military use of space. In our day, the task of preserving peaceful space has acquired special importance. The militarization of space, unless it is reliably barred, will cancel out everything we have succeeded in achieving so far in the field of arms limitation, will push the arms race forward in other directions, and will sharply intensify the danger of nuclear war.

Guided by the desire to make substantial headway in reducing the danger of war, the Soviet Union has come out with the initiative to hold new Soviet-U.S. talks. At the meeting between Comrade A.A. Gromyko and G. Shultz in Geneva, it was agreed that the subject of the talks will be the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms -- strategic and medium-range -- and all these questions will be examined and resolved in a package [vo vzimosvyazi]. The aim of these talks, the joint Soviet-U.S. statement points out, will be to draft effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and strengthening strategic stability.

The Soviet Union's consistent peace-loving course is meeting with the approval and support of the world's peoples. The fraternal socialist countries unanimously approve the USSR peace initiatives.

The Soviet Union's peace-loving policy is meeting with increasingly broad support from those who are interested in halting the arms race, strengthening international security, and sparing mankind the threat of nuclear castastrophe.

The Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state is meeting with warm support from all Soviet people. Employed in peaceful, constructive labor, they are giving all their efforts to the cause of the prosperity of their beloved fatherland. Together with the entire Soviet people, the servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces are fulfilling their patriotic and international duty. By their military labor, they are making a fitting contribution to the consolidation of the peoples' security and are vigilantly standing guard over peace.

PRAVDA CITES PRC PAPER ON SHULTZ-GROMYKO TALKS

PM111033 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "For Peace and Disarmament"]

[Excerpts] There has been widespread reaction in the world to the Geneva meeting between A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Schultz, during which the question of the subject and objectives of the forthcoming Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments was considered and a joint statement was adopted. It is stressed in particular that the aim of the talks will be to elaborate effective accords geared to preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth.

RENMIN RIBAO writes that the step taken in the direction of dialogue between the USSR and the United States accords with the aspirations of the peoples of the world who advocate disarmament and it therefore deserves approval. If the tension in Soviet-American relations starts to ease from now on, this have a positive effect on relations between East and West and will therefore help to ease international tension.

WARSAW PACT SUMMIT LINKED TO CHERNENKO'S HEALTH

NC131535 Paris AFP in English 1508 GMT 13 Jan 85

[By Didier Fauqueux]

[Excerpt] Sofia, Jan 13 (AFP) -- A summit of the seven Warsaw Pact leaders expected here this week hinges on the health of Soviet President Konstantin Chernenko, with a last minute cancellation or switch to Moscow possible, according to Eastern bloc reports.

(Reports from Moscow, quoting East European sources, also mentioned "persistent rumors" concerning a postponement of the summit, or the possibility of its being held in the absence of Mr. Chernenko, who has not been seen in public for 17 days.)

Nevertheless, Bulgarian authorities are going ahead with plans to stage the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, the Eastern bloc military alliance's top body, for Tuesday and Wednesday.

It would be Mr. Chernenko's first foreign trip since he took power last February and the committee's first meeting since June 1982 in Moscow. In the Soviet capital, rumours are circulating that the meeting will be held on Wednesday and Thursday or transferred to Moscow, and even cancelled altogether if Mr. Chernenko is unwell. But the authorities here have continued with preparations and opened a press centre at Sofia's Moscow Hotel for coverage of the summit, which is expected to discuss the U.S.-Soviet agreement to discuss disarmament reached in Geneva earlier this month.

ROHLICEK ARRIVES IN MOSCOW FOR CEMA SESSION

LD132239 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1800 GMT 13 Jan 85

[Text] A Czechoslovak delegation led by Rudolf Rohlicek, federal deputy premier and permanent Czechoslovak representative at the CEMA, arrived by air today in Moscow to attend the 113th session of the CEMA Executive Committee, which will take place 14-16 January.

The delegation was welcomed at Sheremetevo Airport by Nikolay Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and permanent representative at the CEMA, by Vyacheslav Sychev, a secretary of the Council, and other officials.

LATE REPORT: WARSAW PACT SESSION POSTPONED

PM141611 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Jan 85 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed "Joint Announcement"]

[Text] By mutual agreement, the next conference of the Warsaw Pact member-states' Political Consultative Committee, which was planned for mid-January 1985, has been postponed until a later date which is to be agreed upon.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD112142 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 11 Jan 85

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Pavel Kasparov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; with Aleksandr Zholkver and Vladimir Tsvetov, Central Television and All-Union Radio political observers; Nikolay Shishlin, international affairs journalist; and Yevgeniy Kachanov, commentator]

U.S.-Soviet Talks

[Excerpts] [Kasparov] I fought my way across half of Europe and know well what war means, writes Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov, a veteran of war and labor from the village of Krivozerye in Penza Oblast. I experienced it personally in all its severity. That is why the peace we live in is so dear to me. However, the international situation has recently deteriorated sharply.

I invite Aleksandr Zholkver to tell us about the state and prospects of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Zholkver] The questions asked by our listeners are troubling people today not only in our country. After all, in many respects the world situation as a whole depends on the state of Soviet-American relations, since these two countries bear a special responsibility for ensuring peace in the world, and for seeing to it that people everywhere can live and work in peace.

Everybody knows that current relations between the USSR and the United States are fairly tense. On the far side of the ocean some people even assert that the maintenance of this tension is, supposedly, something inevitable, almost preordained. Such fatalism, however, is alien to us. Let us recall that when both sides displayed a readiness to adhere to the principle of equality and equal security they reached mutually acceptable accords, on arms limitation, among other things, and relations between them changed for the better.

I hardly need to say that during the years of war against fascism the differences in ideology and social systems did not stop us from working together in the struggle against the common enemy. In the postwar period the USSR and the United States concluded a whole number of important agreements, from the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water to the timeless Soviet-American agreement on averting a nuclear war.

This list could be even greater if the United States had not so stubbornly opposed the adoption of other constructive initiatives taken by our country that envisaged, in particular, the complete cessation of nuclear tests, the banning of chemical weapons, and moreover, universal and complete disarmament.

However, the whole point of the matter is that certain, very influential circles in the United States are saying that, in order to conclude an agreement with the Soviet Union in arms limitation, the United States must be stronger than the USSR. In short, it is a question of a desire to achieve military superiority. This, naturally, is something incompatible with honest, businesslike talks on questions concerning the national security of the sides.

This is what happened, for example, with the Geneva talks on limiting strategic nuclear armaments and medium-range nuclear armaments. These talks were finished off [vzorvany] by the Pershings and Tomahawks which the United States deployed in a number of countries of Western Europe.

A principally new, much more dangerous situation was created. It was aggravated even more when the United States embarked on the practical implementation of the concept of the notorious star wars. In these conditions the Soviet Union more than once proposed that urgent, effective measures be taken to avert a further spiral of the arms race, and not to permit its proliferation into outer space. In particular, a quite specific proposal was made by the Soviet leadership to begin, in the autumn of last year, talks in Vienna on averting the militarization of outer space. Unfortunately, at the time, the United States did not accept this proposal. Months more were needed before the present meeting in Geneva could take place, again at our country's initiative.

Now agreement has been reached that the subject of the forthcoming Soviet-American talks will be the whole complex of questions concerning space and nuclear armaments -- strategic and medium-range -- and, at the same time, all these questions will be examined and tackled in liaison [vo vzaimosvyazi].

As indicated in the joint Soviet-American statement, the purpose of the talks will be to work out effective accords directed toward preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth, toward limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, and toward strengthening strategic stability. The date of the start of the talks and their venue will be agreed through diplomatic channels in the course of a month.

So, a certain step has been taken toward initiating a dialogue between the two countries, but it is merely a step compared with those immense tasks that are to be examined during the course of the talks on space and nuclear armaments.

I would like to recall, as Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko stressed recently, that our approach to the talks is based on the fact that they should be honest and businesslike.

The Soviet Union is prepared to cover its part of the route. We shall hope that the United States will do the same, in other words, cover its part of the route in full awareness of the responsibility borne by both great powers.

As for our country, as Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko stressed in his address to the American reader of his book on problems of Soviet-U.S. relations, the Soviet Union stands for equal and, where possible, good relations with the United States, and wishes for accords with the United States on a wide spectrum of issues. We would only wish that the United States judge our proposals objectively, without any prejudice, because prejudice, the absence of any desire to know the truth, has never led to any good, and may have the most serious consequences today.

This remark is doubly true of the United States. A torrent of anti-Soviet fabrications prevents the Americans from learning the truth about our country and its peace-loving policy. This is naturally an obstacle to improvement in our mutual relations.

At the World Peace Assembly in Prague, I heard the members of the U.S. delegation themselves citing truly mind-gobbling facts on this score. For instance, polls conducted among American students showed that not even all of them know which side the Soviet Union was on in the last war, and some of them seriously suppose that it fought with Hitlerite Germany against the United States. The sooner the Americans can shake off this heavy burden of primitive anti-Sovietism, the better for an improvement in Soviet-American relations.

The Soviet Union, as Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko stressed, has always demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate an attentive and balanced approach to everything that determines the state of relations between our countries and can foster an improvement in them.

NATO Described

[Kasparov] In their letters to our program listeners Tamara Mikhaylovna Kurditskaya from Moscow, Comrade Gurov, a participant in the Great Patriotic War now living in Kotlas, Arkhangelsk Oblast, as well as many others ask us to tell what constitutes the aggressive NATO bloc and what countries it comprises.

People justifiably stress the fact that from the moment of its inception, the North Atlantic bloc has been the main source of military danger in the world, and particularly in Europe. All its practical activity, as observers have noted more than once, has been oriented toward exporting counterrevolution and preparing for a war against the USSR and the countries of the socialist community. Not one single NATO member-country has ever been threatened by an attack from outside, even though their armies, during the time the bloc has been existence, have participated in over 130 wars and military conflicts in all regions of the world -- in Europe, Africa, and Latin America.

The United States is placing new types of space-strike complexes on the conveyer belt, for which about $60 billion have already been spent. The military space program is also closely connected with the build-up of so-called classical, i.e. non-nuclear offensive armaments, which were envisaged by the well-known Rogers Plan.

No less dangerous, also, is the fact that today NATO has fully embarked upon the development of new strategic concepts, in accordance with which the unleashing of a war in Europe would be accompanied by immediate combat operations by its troops outside the sphere of the North Atlantic bloc: in the Far East, Southeast Asia, and in the maritime and ocean theaters of combat operations.

Here is something else to which I would like to draw your attention. In the NATO capitals, and in Washington itself, which, as is known, plays first violin in this aggressive imperialist bloc, they are trying to explain away the course toward open militarization that has been taken by the North Atlantic bloc, and the obvious undermining of the foundations of contemporary peace in the world, somehow by considerations of a purely defensive nature. Nevertheless, such statements can hardly delude anyone today. They run counter to the practical aims and deeds of NATO.

U.S.-Canada Defense Treaty

[Kasparov] Our regular listeners Timofey Vasiliyevich Ozhgibkov from the village of Verkhovatiye in Volgograd Oblast and a group of 5th-year students in the Leningrad Kalinin Polytechnical Institute ask us to speak about the American-Canadian air defense treaty in North America, or NORAD for short.

The United States, in using this treaty, has also carried out tests of its cruise missiles in Canada on a number of occasions. The next exercises are planned for January-March 1985 and will be held, according to press reports, in conditions as close to combat situations as possible. The provocative essence of this move by the Pentagon is obvious: The NORAD treaty is closely linked to the NATO bloc. As the Western press has reported more than once, the United States now intends to include NORAD in the system of antimissile defense with space-based elements, which it is creating in violation of international accords. That is why millions of Canadians are now coming out for the abrogation of this treaty.

Japanese Foreign Aid

Judging from our letters, listeners' attention has been drawn by reports of Japan's draft state budget for 1985-86 which the government intends to present for debate by parliament. Listeners are interested, in particular, by the considerable increase in the draft budget of expenditure for economic aid to foreign countries. I have asked our political observer, Vladimir Tsvetov, to tell us about the purpose of Japanese economic assistance, and the reasons for increasing expenditure on it.

[Tsvetov] Indeed, in the draft Japanese state budget allocations for foreign economic ties are proposed to be increased by 7.8 percent. Expenditure on covering state debts that have arisen because of the irrational nature of the capitalist economy is just one of the clauses in the draft budget, which envisages a more rapid rate of growth. It would seem that a country, which essentially lives in debt, should cut down on all its nonproductive spending in order to balance its books. However, this is not happenning. Indeed, allocations for economic assistance abroad, as I have already said, are planned to be increased. However, there is some logic in this. The Japanese Foreign Ministry stated on 7 January that since Japan is part of the free world -- in the West this term means the capitalist world -- then it should defend this world. That is why Japanese economic assistance, the Foreign Ministry statement points out later, is granted primarily to those regions that are of important significance from the point of view of Western strategy. So that nobody is left in the dark about the general sense of this strategy, the Japanese Foreign Ministry made it clear: Assistance is of an anticommunist nature. What does this mean in practice?

Let us take Southeast Asia. Here are situated three socialist countries, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. They are not mentioned in the list of targets of Japanese economic assistance since they are building socialism and have no intention of diverting from this path. So, Japan readily provides funds for economic assistance to the ASEAN member-countries: Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and Brunei. They account for nearly 40 percent of all funds allocated by Japan for economic assistance.

In our broadcasts we have already spoken about the aspirations of Japan and the United States to knock together a so-called Pacific Community, an exclusive grouping which would ultimately be of a military nature.

Economic dependence on Japan, into the snare of which the ASEAN countries are being entrapped because of Japanese economic assistance, threatens to develop into political dependence. It is this that may draw the ASEAN countries into the military bloc contemplated by Japan and the United States.

The Japanese state pursues the interests, first and foremost, not of the recipients of assistance, but of their own monopolist capital. That is why the branches of the economy in the ASEAN countries that might provide these countries with economic self-dependence, are not the ones developing with Japanese assistance, but those branches that Japan needs from the viewpoint of providing it with raw materials. Therefore, the ASEAN countries remain suppliers of rubber, tin, copper ore, oil, timber, coffee, and tea, but not of machine tools, cars, ships, or computers. These products are simply not made in the ASEAN countries.

Such are the reasons why, in conditions of the most severe deficit in state finances, Japan intends to increase it new budget allocations for foreign economic assistance. At the expense of the taxpayers, i.e. the Japanese people, the Japanese Government intends to seek the implementation of its neocolonialist objectives and to win profits for the Japanese entrepeneurs.

TRUD ON TRADE UNIONS' STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, JOBS

PM111322 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Jan 85 p 1

[Editorial: "For the Right to Peace and Labor"]

[Excerpts] The year of 1984 was critical and tense for working people in capitalist countries. The "economic revival" of which so much was spoken by the Western press and in declarations by political leaders, although it did bring about a certain increase in output, nonetheless failed to provide any practical help in improving the economic position of ordinary working people or have an impact on the key indicators that have the greatest effect on their vital interests.

One of the most characteristic features of last year was the further stepping up of the antiwar and antinuclear movement, an increasingly large role in which is played by trade unions.

The struggle for the right to work is inseparable from the struggle for the right to live, for mankind's peaceful future, and against the threat of nuclear conflagration.

Even those trade unions and national trade union centers that until recently stood aside from the antiwar movement are becoming increasingly aware of this. Last year saw the passing of resolutions of questions of disarmament and the prevention of thermonuclear war and in support of the policy of detente, as well as specific programs of action in defense of peace, by the congresses of national trade union centers and sector trade unions in Britain, France, Japan, the FRG, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, the Scandinavian countries, and many other countries.

The holding of the regular Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace on 1 September, when about 70 million working people took part in various events in the Soviet Union alone, was a major event in the international trade union movement's life.

There is no doubt that the working people themselves and their trade unions play an increasingly substantial role in the effort to galvanize the political dialogue between East and West and seek ways to end the arms race and ease general tension in the world, perceiving this process as a most important conditon for a peaceful future and for improving their socioeconomic position.

Further work by trade unions of various orientations in this direction will be all the more successful and effective if they stand more frequently within a united front and conduct joint or parallel actions on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis.

The capitalist world has started the new year torn apart by growing contradictions, with a sense of alarm and lack of confidence in the future.

Many authoritative Western economists predict the start of the next cyclical decline in output following the extremely short-lived "revival." For the working people in capitalist countries and their trade unions, this will mean new trials and the further stepping up of the struggle for the right to work, for the right to live.

PERSHING INCIDENT SHOWS DANGERS OF DEPLOYMENT

LD120809 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] Washington January 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent N. Turkatenko reports: The White House and the Pentagon are leaning over backwards to play down the real significance of an incident at a U.S. military base in West Germany, which, it was officially announced here, has been caused by the accidental ignition of the solid fuel propellant in the engine of a Pershing II missile. As has already been reported, three American servicemen were killed and several others wounded as a result of the incident. A spokesman for the U.S. Defense Department was quick to claim that the incident had been of a local nature, while a White House spokesman said it would make no impact on the program for deploying Pershing II missiles. Both officials tried to reassure the public by claiming that the missile had not been armed with a nuclear warhead and so the accident had not represented any threat.

But those assurances of the government officials were flatly rejected by prominent American specialists. Admiral (Retired) Gene Laroque, head of the Washington Defense Information Center, told this correspondent that such an incident could become the cause of outbreak of a nuclear war. It was well known, he said, that the new American first-strike missiles installed in West Germany were trained on the Soviet Union and their flight time to target was a mere six to eight minutes. The incident at the American miliary base showed, he said, that it was not ruled out that a Pershing launch could be triggered off by a technical mishap or a human error, and it was simply appalling to think of the consequences such an "accident" could have to the European people and all humanity. In this connection Gene Laroque urged an early solution to the problems connected with reducing medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Robert Bowman, director of the Washington-based Institute for Space and Security Studies, also pointed out the danger of a nuclear war breaking out as a result of such incidents. Such occurrences, he said, raised the issue of removing all nuclear weapons from the territories of European countries with pressing urgency.

Pentagon Worried About Protests

LD121456 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] Washington January 12 TASS -- The explosion of a new Pershing II ballistic missile at an American base in West Germany has sent tremors across the backs of officials in the U.S. Department of Defense. The CBS television network reported in its nightly news program Friday evening that the blast, resulting from the self-ignition of the missile's solid fuel propellant, killed three and injured seven American servicemen. The anchorman said that American military command had hurried to make it known that the missile had not been armed. But, the CBS added, the details of the incident were not known since it had occurred at a supersecret U.S. military facility in the midst of a dense forest. Many people had not even suspected it was there. The film shown on the program featured sequences illustrating the mounting wave of protests in West Germany against the dangerous presence of American nuclear missile arsenals in that country. Pentagon officials, the TV network said, were very worried that the incident might galvanize the movement against American medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that the blast at the Heilbronn base was the most serious mishap ever involving American ballistic missiles. The Pentagon has already sent a team of experts to West Germany to investigate the incident.

OBSERVER COMMENTS ON GENERAL VESSEY'S PRC VISIT

OW130630 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1100 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Commentary by station observer Ivanov on visit to China by General John W. Vessey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff]

[Text] U.S. newspapers differ with regard to the purpose of General Vessey's visit to China. However, all papers have reached this consenuss: This is the highest-ranking U.S. military officer to visit China in more than 30 years. This shows that the United States intends to develop U.S.-Chinese military ties. For instance, THE WASHINGTON POST, citing remarks by an official Pentagon representative said: Gen Vessey's 7-day visit to China is an important component part of a plan for a strong and regular U.S.-Chinese military relationship which Washington attempted to build long ago. It is reported that one purpose of Vessey's visit to China is to continue talks on the question of letting U.S. warships enter China's harbors. Some U.S. Defense Department representatives said: U.S. warships entering China's harbors is of symbolic significance. It will be possible to let the Chinese people see the U.S. national flag. However, some U.S. ranking generals openly stated that stationing U.S. warships in China's harbors would be of important significance for promoting the so-called U.S.-Chinese strategic cooperation. In addition, they even pointed out that the United States and China could adopt joint actions at a time when the so-called Soviet menace becomes more and more serious.

Listeners: Remarks on the so-called Soviet menace and the United States and China promoting strategic cooperation are not new. For instance, when U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger visited China in the fall of 1983, numerous remarks about the myth of the Soviet menace were made. While attending talks in Beijing, he spared no efforts to persuade his opposite negotiator to promote strategic cooperation with the United States. Weinberger often pointed out that this cooperation seemed first of all in China's interests. The Pentagon chieftain often said: China has suffered fatal danger from the North since ancient times. Only the United States can prevent China from suffering this danger.

At the beginning of last year, U.S. President Reagan also made similar remarks when he held talks with Beijing leaders in China. However, the Soviet Union has never invaded China. It did not menace China in the past; it will not threaten China in the future either. This is because all this fundamentally contradicts our country's socialist essence. The entire history of Sino-Soviet relations confirms all this. Not only has the Soviet Union never invaded China, but also it has aided China in an all-round way to resist Japanese aggressors and oppose the U.S. imperialists' nuclear threats and their lackey Chiang gang's armed schemes.

We can say affirmatively that Washington also knows very well that remarks about the so-called Soviet menace and the Soviet Union's scheme against China do not hold water. But the U.S. imperialists have already used these remarks, which are hostile to the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and the liberation movement to cover up their plan of aggression. Washington does its utmost to persuade China to promote strategic cooperation with the United States; however, this cooperation is incompatible with China's security and its national interests.

The United States has often benefited at the expense of others. It has oppressed other countries and their people in order to protect its monopoly organizations that are making profits and carry out the expansionist ambitious of these monopoly organizations. Of course, the U.S. imperialists desire very much to confront China with the Soviet Union. Dear listeners, you all understand that the aforementioned intention of U.S. imperialism runs counter to the fundamental vital interests of our two countries and peoples.

PRAVDA CITES NODONG SINMUN ON LIBERATION

PM111207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Resolution Adopted"]

[Text] The Politburo of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee has adopted a resolution on the celebration of the 40th anniversary of Korea's liberation from the Japanese militarists.

NODONG SINMUN, the organ of the WPK Central Committee, has published today in this connection an editorial which notes the historic significance of the rout of Japanese militarism. The country's liberation, the paper writes, constitutes a great victory gained in the course of the joint struggle of the Korean people and the heroic Soviet Army. During World War II, the Soviet Union routed the Japanese militarists and, at the cost of its own casualties, helped our people in the struggle for the motherland's liberation.

The solemn celebration of this date will permit a graphic demonstration of the inviolability of Soviet-Korean friendship and will be of great importance for its further development. This friendship has long-standing traditions and took shape during the historic struggle against the forces of imperialism and for the building of socialism and communism.

During the repulsion of American aggression and in the years of postwar restoration and construction, NODONG SINMUN writes, the Soviet people have rendered the DPRK material assistance and moral support. Today the USSR actively supports the Korean people's struggle for the building of socialism and the peaceful unification of the motherland. The 1984 summit talks in Moscow elevated the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries to a new, higher level.

The party and state organs, cultural institutions, and mass media of the DPRK must step up their political organizational work and carry out the necessary practical measures with a view to actively promoting the development of the friendly relations between the USSR and the DPRK and the strengthening of the forces of socialism, the WPK Central Committee organ points out.

TASS PREVIEWS NAKASONE VISIT TO SOUTH PACIFIC

LD111702 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Moscow January 11 TASS -- TASS political observer Askold Biryukov writes: Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone leaves on Sunday, January 13, on a tour which will take him to four South Pacific countries, namely Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Fiji. The Japanese press says that the main objective of his visit will be to secure the support of the leaders of these countries for the idea of forming the so-called "Pacific community," which is being pushed by Washington and Tokyo. The projected "community" is to include, along with its initiators, also Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, China and the ASEAN countries.

The "Pacific community" idea was first voiced by the late Japanese Premier Masayoshi Ohira who visited Australia and New Zealand exactly five years ago. But at the time the idea was not implemented first of all because the countries of the region to be included in the "community" saw it as a prototype of "a sphere of the co-flourishing of greater eastern Asia" cultivated by militarist Japan during World War II.

Taking into account the concern of the countries of the region about the expansionist ambitions of the United States and Japan, the latter two countries took steps to use other states of the region, for example the ASEAN states, to push the "Pacific community" idea. This, it has been reported, was a subject of recent talks in Los Angeles between the heads of the Washington administration and the Japanese Government. It was also decided during that meeting to move economic and other aspects of planned cooperation to the foreground, avoiding all that could furnish grounds for the accusation of Washington and Tokyo of forging another military alliance.

But the tactical ploy can hardly confuse anyone. Many believe, said the French newspaper LE MONDE, that the "Pacific community" being put together by Japanese and American diplomacy looks like an attempt by the two countries to establish their economic and strategic domination in that part of the world. It is dubious in these conditions that the countries of the region will want to come under another yoke, the Japanese-American one, instead of the yoke which Japan tried to force upon them in World War II.

The peoples of the insular states in the South Pacific are ever more insistent in their demands for the region to be proclaimed a nuclear-free zone. Their voices have got solid support in the person of the New Zealand Government led by David Lange. Last year that government decided to close the country's ports to ships with nuclear weapons and atomic propulsion units, which caused the undisguised irritation of Washington. Lange said in a recent interview with the Japanese television network NHK that New Zealand did not want either nuclear weapons of its own or to be protected with the help of such weapons. Naturally enough, questions of nuclear arms will inevitably take a prominent place during the forthcoming talks of the leaders of these countries with the prime minister of Japan, who supports U.S. nuclear strategy, including the so-called "star wars" program. It is also expected that these countries will voice strong objections to Tokyo's intentions to set a radioactive waste dump in that part of the Pacific.

It is not on this basis that it is possible and necessary to develop genuine cooperation in the Pacific. It remains to be seen whether this is realized in Tokyo.

DRA CONTINUES CELEBRATION OF PDPA JUBILEE

Karmal Addresses Ceremony

PM111346 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Portentous Anniversary"]

[Excerpt] Kabul, 10 Jan -- The Afghan people are celebrating a portentous date -- the 20th anniversary of the formation of the PDPA.

Representatives of the public have arrived in the Afghan capital for the festivities from all over the Republic, and there are numerous foreign guests. They include a CPSU delegation headed by I.B. Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, and delegations from 27 fraternal communist and workers parties and Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Today, a ceremonial session of the PDPA Central Committee and the DRA Revolutionary Council and Council of Ministers was held in Kabul. It was opened by B. Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council. He delivered the report entitled "The PDPA Is the Inspirer and Organizer of the People's Struggle for National and Social Progress."

The glorious April Revolution was accomplished under the PDPA's leadership, the speaker said. It opened a new page in the homeland's history, and the revolutionary renewal of ancient Afghanistan began. The birth of the PDPA signified the coming of a new stage in the struggle for the homeland's revolutionary renewal. On becoming the ruling party, our party assumed a tremendous historic responsibility for the fate of the revolution, the people, and the homeland. Today, the PDPA is a continuously growing, increasingly mass party. At the time of the April Revolution it had 18,000 members. Over the past 6 and 1/2 years, despite all the difficulties and losses, its strength has increased to 120,000 members and candidates. Party organizations have been created and are functioning in all provinces, cites, the majority of districts and counties, labor collectives, military units, and in many villages.

Describing the situation in the country, B. Karmal pointed out that the chief and fundamental cause of the difficulties being experienced is the manifest and stubborn desire of imperialism and international reaction to prevent the existence of a free and progressive Afghanistan and to smother the April Revolution. Hundreds of millions of dollars, pounds, and marks are being spent on forming, training, and equipping counterrevolutionary gangs; on providing them with the most modern weapons, including heavy weapons; on unbridled, false anti-Afghan propaganda, and on deceiving the international public.

The world is still not well enough aware of what scale the undeclared war against Afghanistan has assumed. Here are just a few examples: Counterrevolutionaries have destroyed 1,814 school buildings, 31 hospitals, 11 health centers, 906 peasant cooperatives, hundreds of trucks, 14,000 km of telephone lines, hundreds of electricity poles, and so forth. The total damage caused by the crimes of the counterrevolution has already exceeded 35 billion afghanis. However, all the attempts by imperialism and reaction to disrupt our economy and frustrate progress along our outlined path are failing. The enemies have achieved one thing: They have totally exposed their antipopular essence.

The successful resolution of the main tasks at the current stage of the revolution, including the struggle against counterrevolution, demands unremitting attention to the state of affairs on the economic front. Our achievements in the economic sphere are still modest. However, we have the right to speak of them today because we have achieved them under complex conditions.

The PDPA, the speaker declared, has proclaimed the struggle to strengthen peace throughout the world, to prevent a new world war, and for peaceful coexistence to be the principle of its foreign policy.

On becoming the ruling party, the PDPA demonstrated in practice its loyalty to this principle. We have done everything possible to strengthen and defend peace. This is precisely why the PDPA and the DRA Government resolutely support the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries aimed at strengthening world peace and the peoples' security.

We highly evaluate and fully approve the positive peace initiatives advanced by the Afghans' sincere friend, Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and by the leaders of the other socialist countries, and we will make our contribution to the noble cause of defending peace throughout the world and in the region.

The coincidence of our positions on current fundamental international questions is natural and law-governed and stems from the history and essence of Afghan-Soviet relations. On behalf of the entire PDPA and all the national patriotic forces of Afghanistan, B. Karmal emphasized, I declare that the relations between our country and the USSR and between our parties, governments, and peoples are relations of fraternity, all-around mutual understanding, and cooperation.

It is with a sense of special appreciation and gratitude, the Afghan leader emphasized, that we speak of the unparalleled international assistance given by the Soviet Union during our most difficult days. The Soviet Union's heroic sons came to help the people of Afghanistan to uphold the country's independence and integrity and defend the April Revolution.

Our party and the DRA Government, the speaker pointed out, reaffirm all their initiatives advanced earlier for settling disputed and unresolved problems in the relations with Pakistan and Iran. We positively evaluate the talks that are being held with Pakistan through the UN secretary general's personal representative. The PDPA and the DRA Government take a constructive approach to questions of the speediest achievements of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

We declare once again that the people of Afghanistan are ready to continue selflessly guarding their revolutionary gains. They will never deviate from their chosen path, and no one must doubt their firm determination to deal a crushing rebuff to any outside aggression and pressure. Where the matter concerns Afghanistan, there are no problems that could not be removed by just and democratic means, by the method of political solutions.

If this cannot be done today, we will work patiently and persistently together with our friends to bring such solutions closer tomorrow, B. Karmal declared in conclusion.

I.B. Usmankhodzhayev read the CPSU Central Committee greetings message to the PDPA Central Committee, which was greeted warmly by the people present, and presented it to B. Karmal.

Anniversary Activities Noted

LD112253 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 11 Jan 85

["Report From Kabul"]

[Text] Participants in the festive session of the PDPA Central Committee and the DRA Revolutionary Council and Council of Ministers devoted to the 20th anniversary of founding of the PDPA and delegations of the fraternal communist and workers' parties today took part in a wreath-laying ceremony at the monument to the heroes of the April Revolution. The CPSU delegation, headed by Usmankhodzayev, first secretary of Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, was among them. Subsequently, the guests visited the exhibition of DRA national economic achievements and the exposition, organized within the framework of the exhibition, devoted to the Afghan-Soviet economic, technical and, cultural cooperation.

During the second half of the day, the party's Central Committee gave a reception to mark the PDPA's 20th anniversary. Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, and chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Republic, who addressed the reception, expressed gratitude to the representatives of the friendly and fraternal parties for their participation in the ceremonies marking the party's anniversary. Having noted the considerable successes attained by the country in the implementation of economic and social transformations in the interests of wide masses of the people, Babrak Karmal called for stepping up the struggle for peace, against the danger of nuclear war, and expressed support for the USSR's peace-loving proposals.

CPSU Delegation Departs

LD121310 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] Kabul January 12 TASS -- A CPSU delegation headed by the member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Inamzhon Usmankhodzayev, which attended the celebration on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the creation of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, left for home today.

IRAN'S ACT OF HOSTILITY AGAINST DRA CONDEMNED

NC121240 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Station commentary]

[Text] Recently, the Afghan Foreign Ministry protested to the Iranian Government about armed Iranian operations against the Republic of Afghanistan. Our commentator writes:

The shelling of an Afghan border post from Iranian territory, leading to the death of a number of Afghan civilians and to the capture of a number of wounded Afghans, is a fresh act of hostility committed by Iran against Afghanistan. The Afghan Foreign Ministry's note to the Iranian Government points out that such armed provocations can only aggravate the two neighboring countries' relations. From the very first days after the victory of the April Revolution and the founding of Democratic Afghanistan, the imperialists and the region's reactionary forces have resorted to an undeclared war on the people of Afghanistan. Those forces in Iran that were enraged by the news of the abolition of the feudal system and the establishment of a popular regime in their neighboring country have diligently participated in this undeclared war.

The reactionary forces in Iran, which have been detaining some Afghans on Iranian territory for many years through deceit and force, are trying to use these Afghans in provocative acts against neighboring Afghanistan. Last summer, the Special Organization for the Salvation of Afghan Refugees, which operates in Iran, said in a message to international organizations that the Afghans who previously lived in various parts of Iran were to be sent to special camps similar to those built in Lebanon by the Israelis. Counterrevolutionary organizations such as the so-called Jami'at-e Eslami-ye Afghanistan, which have taken refuge in Iran and are operating under the aegis of local officials, send these Afghans, who were forcibly gathered in camps, into neighboring Afghanistan to commit acts of piracy and terrorism. Those who refuse to participate in such operations are pitilessly executed in the wildernesses of Zahedan and Taftan.

Despite the terror and coercion used by the Iranian officials, thousands of Afghans have accepted the DRA Government's invitation and are returning to their homeland. (?Many former members) of counterrevolutionary groups, including the Jami'at-e Afghanistan, took advantage of the general amnesty granted by the Afghan Government and returned to their homeland, where they are now involved in peaceful work.

The Afghan Government has repeatedly proposed to the Iranian and Pakistani officials that they end their provocations against Afghanistan and that all conflicts and outstanding problems in their relations be resolved through talks. Babrak Karmal, leader of Democratic Afghanistan, has often reiterated this call. However, the shelling of an Afghan border post from Iranian territory proves that the Iranian officials wish to pursue a policy of armed provocations against their neighbor. This is why the DRA Foreign Ministry (?resolutely) demanded in its note of protest to the Iranian Government that such provocations be immediately halted, and stressed that the responsibility for such savage acts lies completely with the Iranian Government.

PRAVDA NOTES CONTINUING U.S. AID TO DUSHMANS

PM111018 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Inspiring the Dushmans"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Jan -- The Reagan administration intends to continue to step up its support for counterrevolutionary gangs waging the undeclared war against Democratic Afghanistan.

As reactionary Senator G. Humphrey stated in an interview for THE WASHINGTON TIMES, in the near future Washington will officially grant the dushmans some $2 million in the form of so-called "humanitarian aid." But this "aid" has nothing in common with the concepts of humanitarianism -- the butchers of the Afghan people will use these resources to buy more instruments of murder. The notorious program of "humanitarian aid" to the bandits is one of the official channels of support for the terrorist formations which the CIA trains, arms, and sends into the DRA from Pakistan territory. The White House plans to supply the counterrevolutionaries with arms worth a total of some $280 million through the U. S. spy department's secret channels in the current fiscal year.

U.S. ENVOY VIEWS FRANCE'S NEW CALEDONIA PROBLEMS

LD112347 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Paris January 11 TASS -- A statement made by Evan Galbraith, the U.S. ambassador to Paris, can only be viewed as flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of France. He "lectured" in an interview to the "France-Inter" radio station on how France should resolve the problems of New Caledonia. Galbraith said that France "must not leave the archipelago". French presence in that area, according to him, is a stabilizing factor. He stressed Washington's fears over the possibility of New Caledonia becoming "a new Grenada" and pointed out that the status quo in the Pacific met the interests of the United States.

The White House has long displayed a heightened interest in events in New Caledonia. LE JOURNAL DU DIMANCHE reported that during the recent period the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency stepped up its operations in that French overseas territory. In addition, according to press reports, the head of government of New Caledonia, Dick Ukeiwe, who represents a right-wing party of the archipelago, recently paid a visit to Washington and conferred with senior State Department officials. The U.S. Administration's interest in the preservation of the status of New Caledonia is explained by its exceptionally sensitive situation in the region and by the presence of Pentagon facilities on the archipelago.

NEW ZEALAND'S LANGE CONFIRMS NUCLEAR SHIPS POLICY

LD112035 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Tokyo January 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin reports:

New Zealand's Prime Minister David Lange turned down Washington's claims to the role of New Zealand's self-styled "protector" against a non-existent external threat. New Zealand does not need foreign nuclear protection, he said in an interview to the Japanese broadcasting corporation NHK. The security of the southern Pacific must be ensured above all by the absence of mass destruction weapons in the area and it is for this that the states of the region now declare ever more resolutely, the prime minister said. David Lange confirmed that his government will never admit into waters of New Zealand foreign vessels with nuclear weapons on board. 76 percent of New Zealand's population declares in support of this course, according to public opinion polls, AMPO magazine reports. Washington now attempts to twist the arms of a disobedient country, the magazine writes. It resorts to everything -- to economic blackmail with the use of transnational corporations, to a campaign of slander in the right-wing press, to operations to discredit leaders of the right-wing Labour Party. Special measures are taken to prevent small states in the southern part of the Pacific from following New Zealand's example, AMPO writes. The White House tries to turn those countries into strongholds of its aggressive strategy in the region.

The United States CIA is now preparing an operation to destabilize David Lange's cabinet, Chairman of New Zealand's Council for Universal Peace Gerald O'Bryen [spelling as received] told the TASS correspondent. In this connection Gerald O'Bryen recalled that it was not without the assistance of the U.S. special services that the Labour governments in Australia and New Zealand were removed from office in the seventies. They, too, were demanding the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific and were declaring against the Pentagon's sway in the area. Gerald O'Bryen emphasized the readiness of the people of New Zealand to wage a struggle in defense of their sovereignty, against the designs of Washington which tries to keep New Zealand in a dependent position.

PRAVDA CITES JABLONSKI ON POLISH, WORLD SITUATION

PM111042 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[Text] Warsaw, 10 Jan -- The foreign policy of People's Poland is a policy of peace and security. This is irrefutably confirmed by the entire 40-year period since the war. Together with its Warsaw Pact allies Poland will do everything possible to help improve international relations and deliver Europe and the world from the new threat of war, H. Jablonski, chairman of the Polish State Council, stated when he spoke here.

Despite the difficulties in the economy caused by discriminatory measures by Western countries against Poland, the speaker said, we assess positively the results achieved by the country's national economy. Increasing activeness is displayed by the Patriotic Movement of National Rebirth: a united platform for collaboration between all political organizations and public forces with an interest in Poland's further development. A national trade union agreement has been approved. This is an important step along the path of strengthening the revived trade union movement. The logical consequence of this development is the decision on preparations for elections to the Polish Sejm, which will take place in 1985.

Poland is consistently strengthening its all-around ties with the fraternal countries, first and foremost the Soviet Union. This cooperation will be further developed this year. Poland also displays readiness to develop relations with all states on the basis of sovereignty, equality, and the mutual recognition of political and social realities. A dangerous situation, H. Jablonski noted, has emerged in Europe, where in the Western countries, alongside the buildup of the arms race, voices are being raised against the territorial and political structure on the European Continent.

OLSZOWSKI ADDRESS AT ANNIVERSARY MEETING CITED

LD121327 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] A meeting has taken place in Warsaw devoted to the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the PPR. It was addressed by Olszowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and PPR foreign minister. He stressed that the alliance of friendship and cooperation between the PPR and the USSR is a considerable factor in the strengthening of the unity of the countries of the socialist community, a firm element of the postwar political and territorial arrangement in Europe. It is precisely by relying on the alliance with the USSR, Olszowski said, that socialist Poland is able not only to resolve complicated problems of its development but also to make a worthy contribution to international politics.

NEW TIMES ON REASONS FOR BUILDING BERLIN WALL

PM071554 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 52, Dec 84 p 21

[Nikita Zholkver reply to reader's question under the rubric "Taking Up a Point"]

[Text] Why was the Berlin wall built? The Western news media claim it is there basically to prevent East Berliners from defecting. Is that the case?

Filippo Scaglione, Catania, Italy.

Our staff writer Nikita Zholkver replies:

No, that is not the case. Let us return to August 13, 1961, and the weeks leading up to what bourgeois propaganda has termed a "black day." On June 14 of that year the West German Bundestag decided to block the development of diplomatic relations with socialist countries until they agreed to a revision of Europe's existing boundaries. On July 7, the ruling CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] bloc announced its objective of "liberating" the G.D.R. and creating a single Germany incorporated in NATO.

On August 1, on the insistence of the then West German Defence Minister, Franz Josef Strauss, NATO forces were put on enhanced alert. Some 20,000 Bundeswehr reservists were called up. At about the same time an exercise in landing U.S. paratroops in West Germany was carried out. Some Bundeswehr units were deployed on the very border of the G.D.R.

Now you might be wondering what all this has to do with the Berlin wall. But Berlin was to serve as another Sarajevo. As everyone knows, before a major offensive is launched the heavy guns start up. This time the big guns were in the nature of psychological warfare. Berlin's open border served this purpose well, as a stream of propaganda leaflets inciting the people of the G.D.R. to "stoke the tension up to bursting point" poured across. Through this route spies and saboteurs infiltrated democratic Berlin. On August 7 they tried to burn down the meat-packing plant in order to disrupt the city's meat supplies and kindle popular resentment. On August 11 they dynamited the Humboldt University. U.S. Senator James Fulbright noted at the time that he could not understand why the G.D.R. did not close its borders with West Berlin, as it was quite entitled to do.

You will agree, Signor Scaglione, that every state holds the sovereign right to institute the kind of frontier regime it believes essential. This fully applies to the state border running through Berlin. Moreover, the frontier cutting through Berlin is not just a border between the G.D.R. and West Berlin, but a watershed, if you like between two worlds, between the Warsaw Treaty states and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. After all, the troops of three NATO member states are stationed in West Berlin.

The border was closed in the early hours of August 13, 1961, and control of all transit points was assumed by units of the National People's Army and armed workers.

These, then, were the political reasons for strengthening the frontier running through Berlin. In the autumn of 1964 the Hamburg weekly Stern noted: "It is increasingly obvious that that day (August 13, 1961) was a landmark in German history, one as significant as November 11, 1918 and May 8, 1945. It signified the third defeat -- this time, thank God, a bloodless one -- of the German policy, which sought to better Germany's positions by means of pressure, coercion and the cold war, and eventually a shooting war if need be."

Though one really need say no more, I believe it necessary to switch from the political aspect to economic factors that were also important.

Take the following. The total damage the GDR suffered as a result of the open border has been put at 120 billion marks, or more than its annual industrial output at that time. What caused these stupendous losses?

By 1961 the luring of thousands of G.D.R. citizens westwards reached unprecedented proportions.

Some highly qualified specialists received tempting offers, others were victimized by blackmail and spurious accusations. Young people, unaware of capitalist realities, were hooked by advertisements and propaganda. This practice went so far as to include kidnapping of children to induce their parents to defect to West Berlin. Such large concerns as Flick, Siemens, AEG, Telefunken, Krupp and Messerschmitt maintained clandestine personnel recruitment offices.

Another aspect of the economic warfare against the G.D.R. was the luring of democratic Berlin residents to work in West Berlin. There they were exploited as cheap labour and scabs. Due to an advantageous currency exchange rate they profited at the expense of the G.D.R. population, since they took advantage of all the gains of worker-peasant power, giving nothing in return. In 1961 there were 63,000 such people officially registered. A rough-and-ready estimate puts the G.D.R.'s annual losses at nearly 2.5 billion marks due to these people dodging work for the G.D.R. economy.

Currency speculation, enabling West Berliners to snap up food products in democratic Berlin at privileged prices, likewise did its damage.

These, then, were the actual political and economic factors impelling the G.D.R. authorities, in agreement with their allies, to close the Berlin border. Subsequent developments demonstrated that this decision was the correct one.

Incidentally, at the time this was admitted by many in the West. LIBERATION of Paris wrote: "It is not quite a normal act for the G.D.R. to protect itself from the provocations at which the politicians of Bonn and West Berlin are so adept? Any measures that prevents the powder keg from blowing up cannot be bad just because it emanates from the East."

However, today, as you have so rightly noted, bourgeois propaganda harps on other tunes to distort the substance of the G.D.R. Government's policy. Its aim is to get at the G.D.R. from within, to shatter its socialist regime. However, these methods failed even when the border was still open. They have no chance now.

SOVIET-ALBANIAN COOPERATION NOTED ON ANNIVERSARY

PM141113 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jan 85 Morning Edition p 5

[G. Mitkevich article: "Albania's Historic Date"]

[Text] The 39th anniversary of Albania's proclamation as a people's republic occurred on 11 January. That historic act was the logical conclusion of the Albanian people's struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party of Albania (now the Albanian Workers Party) for the final liquidation of the monarchy and the creation of a new state representing the power of the working people.

After the country's liberation from the fascist occupiers in November 1944 and the establishment of people's power, internal and external reaction made desperate attempts to slow down Albania's advance along the path of progress. In that complex situation the Soviet Union gave the Albanian working people resolute support. The Soviet Government recognized the provisional democratic government of Albania without any conditions or reservations and established diplomatic relations with it. That decision significantly enhanced the prestige of people's power in the country and created a serious obstacle to the intrigues of imperialist reaction against Albania. It was valued on its true merits by the Albanian working people, who regarded it not only as recognition of their services in the liberation struggle against fascism but also as friendly support in the cause of country's democratic transformation.

In the elections to the Constituent Assembly held on 2 December 1945 the country's progressive forces, united in the Democratic Front, which was led by the Communist Party of Albania, won a convincing victory. More that 93 percent of the voters voted for the front's candidates. At its 11 January 1946 session the Constituent Assembly proclaimed Albania a people's republic, and on 14 March the same year the first democratic constitution in the country's history was adopted.

Over the years since then the Albanian people have scored significant successes in developing their motherland's economy and culture. In Albania, which before liberation was one of the most backward agrarian countries in Europe, a multisector industry has been created that now produces as much in 2 days as was produced in the whole of 1938. The country's working class has grown by a factor of 38 compared with the prewar period, gross agricultural output has increased 430 percent, and per capita national income has increased more than 400 percent. Railroads have been built and a merchant maritime fleet has been created, neither of which were known in the old Albania. The full electrification of all cities and villages has been carried out. Appreciable progress has also been made in the spheres of education, culture, science, health care, and enhancement of the working people's well-being.

The labor of Soviet people has also had a considerable share in Albania'a achievements. As early as 1945 the Soviet Union, itself experiencing great difficulties but true to its international duty, began giving Albania the necessary assistance. Thousands of tons of grain were delivered to the country to remove the threat of starvation, and the first Soviet specialists were sent to help restore the war-ravaged economy. The Soviet aid to the Albanian people continued to increase steadily in following years. Our country granted to Albania large credits and free economic, scientific, technical, and other assistance. Hundreds of Soviet specialists worked selflessly side by side with Albanians in various sectors of the national economy and in the sphere of science, culture, and education. Thousands of highly skilled Albanian workers and specialists were trained with the Soviet Union's assistance.

That disinterested assistance and all-around Soviet-Albanian cooperation did a lot to help accelerate the country's socioeconomic development. By the end of 1955 Albania had already been turned into an agrarian-industrial state, and by the beginning of 1961 the economic base of socialism had been built in the country. As an Albanian Government statement pointed out in November 1956, "the Albanian people's rescue from age-old slavery, the triumph of the people's revolution, and the creation and strengthening of a new socialist state would have been impossible without the Soviet Union's assistance and all-around disinterested support."

However, in the early 1960's the fruitful Albanian-Soviet cooperation was disrupted. The Soviet Union's position with regard to Albania is well known. Our country consistently advocates the improvement of the situation in Albanian-Soviet relations. Given mutual goodwill, it would be possible to resolve this question in the interests of both states' peoples and of the cause of peace and socialism.

In congratulating the working people of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania on the portentous date in the country's history, Soviet people wish them peace, prosperity, and successes in socialist building.

Friendship Group Meets

PM111121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To Mark the Anniversary"]

[Text] A session of the board of the Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society was held in Moscow on 10 January to mark a noteworthy event in Albanian history.

It was noted that 39 years ago, on 11 January 1946, the Constituent Assembly, expressing the people's will, proclaimed Albania a people's republic. The establishment of people's democratic power and the proclamation of the republic created favorable conditions for the implementation of profound socioeconomic transformations on socialist principles, whose successful implementation promoted all-round cooperation between the People's Albania and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

BAYBAKOV MEETS WITH CSSR'S HUSAK IN PRAGUE

PM141027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Talk"]

[Text] Prague, 11 Jan -- G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR, received N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

In the course of the friendly talk that took place, they discussed the state of work on the program for long-term economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and the CSSR through the year 2000 and on coordinating the two countries' national economic plans for 1986-1990. It was stressed that the deepening cooperation in industry, science, and technology, together with the program for socialist production sharing, is a decisive factor in the modernization and intensification of all sectors of the economy.

BRIEFS

HUNGARIAN AMITY PROTOCOL -- A protocol on cooperation between the Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Society and the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society was signed in Moscow today. The document envisages the further expansion of fraternal ties between the public of the two countries. Meetings and soirees devoted to national holidays and noteworthy dates in the USSR and Hungary, friendship festivals, and the exchange of delegations and exhibitions among other things, are planned. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 10 Jan 85 LD]

GDR CINEMATOGRAPHY PLAN -- A plan for cooperation with GDR cinematographers during 1985 was signed today at the USSR State Committee for Cinematography. As noted by Horst Pehnert, GDR deputy minister of culture and leader of the fraternal country's delegation of cinematography officials to the Moscow talks, measures connected with the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the liberation from fascism, the World Youth Festival, and the Moscow International Film Festival will be the most important features of joint work during the coming year. One important event during the year will be the gala premiere of the film "Victory." The DEFA studio took part in work on this film. The Berlin premiere will be held in early May. German cinematographers will also take part in the all-union film festival which will be held in Minsk in May. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 11 Jan 85 LD]

MAHMUD 'ABBAS, PLO DELEGATION VISIT USSR 6-11 JAN

Exchange of Views Held

LD112216 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Moscow January 11 TASS -- Member of the Executive Committee of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, President of the Palestine-Soviet Friendship Society Mahmud 'Abbas and Palestinian public figure Abu al-Abbas stayed in Moscow from January 6 to 11.

An exchange of views on questions of promoting Soviet-Palestinian public ties and further developing the activity of friendship societies was held at the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. The Soviet people's invariable solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their legitimate national rights, including the right to self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state was reaffirmed.

KUNA Interviews 'Abbas

LD111124 Kuwait KUNA in English 1037 GMT 11 Jan 85

[By Abdul Wahab al-Khashan]

[Text] Moscow, Jan 11 (KUNA) -- The head of the visiting Palestinian delegation, PLO Executive Committee Member Mahmud 'Abbas, hailed Soviet efforts toward normalizing Syrian-Palestinian relations and expressed satisfaction at the talks he held with Soviet officials. 'Abbas told Kuwait News Agency (KUNA) his visit here is "in implementation to a resolution by the Executive Committee to send delegations representing the PLO to a number of Arab and friendly countries, including the Soviet Union." He added that "we came here to explain to our Soviet comrades the details about the convening of the Palestine National Council and its results, and we clearly and frankly spoke about the developments which took place following Aden-Algiers Agreement and the meetings with the Democratic Alliance and the reasons for holding the PNC's session in Amman."

The Palestinian official stressed that "we have done our best so that the PNC session be attended by all Palestinian groups, particularly the signatories of Aden-Algiers Agreements." The agreement was signed between Fatah Central Committee and the Democratic Alliance which groups the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP), the Palestine Liberation Front and the Palestinian Communist Party. The accord was on the inter-Palestinian dialogue and the holding of the PNC's 17th session.

'Abbas regretted "the efforts made by Syria with the Democratic Alliance which led to the holding of the PNC in Amman," adding that "we have been keen at the PNC's 17th session to adopt resolutions that are completely harmonious with those adopted by the 16th session and to continue our dialogue with the Democratic Alliance and we left vacancies in the PLO Executive Committee to be filled after reaching an agreement with them."

The PLO Executive Committee member said he is optimistic on the possibility of reaching an agreement with the DFLP and the Palestinian Communist Party, but this is unlikely with the PFLP because, as he said, it is "following the Syrian regime" charging the front of losing much of its independence.

He ruled out the possibility of moving the PLO headquarters from Tunis to Amman at present and said the return of the PLO to Lebanon is linked with reaching an agreement on that issue with the Lebanese Government, that is acceptable by both parties.

'Abbas reiterated support to the Soviet proposal on holding an international conference on peace in the Middle East, in which the two superpowers take part as well as the PLO on equal footing with all parties concerned.

'Abbas praised Soviet efforts to normalize relations between the PLO and Syria and to organize relations between Fatah Central Committee and the Democratic Alliance. He reiterated that "we are ready to correct our relations with Syria on the basis of the independence of the Palestinian decision and the non-interference in our internal relations."

On the Palestinian relations with Egypt, 'Abbas said "we are very keen not only to resume relations between the PLO and Egypt but also restore ties between Egypt and all Arab countries on clear and frank grounds."

ISRAELI TRANSPORT OF ETHIOPIAN JEWS CONDEMNED

LD101849 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 10 Jan 85

[Text] The "Moses" operation carried out by Israeli agents has aroused widespread reaction in the Arab world. Its significance is that Israeli agents exploited the natural calamity that befell Ethiopia, namely the drought and severe shortage of foodstuff, and engineered an operation to move Ethiopian Jews to neighboring Sudan. From the Sudan, they established an airbridge and transported them to Israel.

According to Arab and Western media, the total number of Ethiopian Jews transported is about 15,000. The secret was disclosed and Tel Aviv tried to portray the operation as a humanitarian act to combat the natural calamity. However, it is absolutely clear that Tel Aviv was not thinking about any humanitarian act. Proof of this are the following facts: First, one does not carry out a humanitarian act in secrecy; if Israel wished to help Ethiopia and other African countries in combatting the natural calamity, it would have done this just like any other state or international organization that sent food supplies, doctors, and essential equipment. However, the matter does not rest there. According to a dispatch from Rabat, Tel Aviv is planning to resettle the Ethiopian Jews along the Lebanese borders so that they will carry out police duties.

Quoting informed sources, the Algerian EL MOUDJAHID said that the Ethiopian Jews will be used to colonize the occupied Arab territories and carry out the repressive punitive actions there. In short, they are meant to be the gun muzzle for Israeli expansionists. It is not by chance that Tunisia requested the Arab League to call for a special meeting to look into the implications of the Israeli "Moses" operation.

The Tunisian TEMPS said that Peres and his clique decided, under the pretext of carrying out this so-called humanitarian operation, to resettle the Jews of Ethiopia in the occupied Arab territories in order to accelerate the process of expelling the genuine Palestinian inhabitants from these territories.

TASS CITES IRANIAN, IRAQI BATTLE REPORTS

8 January

LD081803 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 8 Jan 85

[Text] Baghdad January 8 TASS -- Iraqi warplanes today again attacked a "large naval target" south of the Iranian Island of Khark in a third such raid in the area of the Iranian oil-handling terminal in the Persian Gulf in the past 24 hours, a spokesman for the High Military Command of Iraq reported.

The latest Iraqi military communique said that in the past two days Iraqi aircraft flew more than 100 combat sorties, bombing enemy positions in the Maysan sector and in the district east of Basra.

Iranian artillery shelled Basra's suburbs.

Nicosia January 8 TASS - Artillery shoot-outs took place on several sectors of the front yesterday. The news agency IRNA of Iran reported. Iranian batteries were able to destroy several combat positions, storages, observation posts and other military facilities of the enemy. Iraqi troops suffered manpower and material losses.

14 January

LD141118 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 14 Jan 85

[Text] Baghdad January 14 TASS - Iraq's high military command has circulated a war communique, saying that Iraqi anti-aircraft units shots down an enemy plane in the Maysan sector during the past twenty-four hours. Iraqi fighter-planes hit another two "naval targets" in the area of the Iranian island of Khark in the Persian Gulf. Iraqi helicopters distroyed two Iranian boats.

According to the communique, Iraqi artillery hit Iranian positions and troop concentration areas with aimed fire in the central section of the front, in the Maysan sector and to the east of Basra. The Iranians suffered losses in man and hardware.

Nicosia January 14 TASS - Iran's news agency IRNA reports that Iranian aircraft bombed yesterday combat positions, headquarters and communications and rear facilities of the enemy in southern Iraq. Several weapon emplacements, other military facilities were destroyed, tens of Iraqi servicemen were killed and wounded. In the Abadan region, Iranian units repulsed several Iraqi attacks. Artillery exchanges were held in the southern and northern sectors of the front.

Iraqi batteries continued the bombardment of the city of Abadan.

GROMYKO, FRENCH ENVOY EXCHANGE LUNCHEON TOASTS

PM141002 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception for French Ambassador"]

[Text] Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon on 11 January for French Ambassador to the Soviet Union Claude Arnaud in connection with his final departure from Moscow.

When the toasts were exchanged, both sides stressed that the deepening of relations between the USSR and France in different spheres meets the vital interests of the Soviet and French peoples. At the present stage of the development of international affairs, the cooperation of the two countries is called upon to contribute to a substantial improvement of the European and international situation.

U.S. TO 'SECRETLY' BRING MISSILES TO BELGIUM

PM111253 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 85 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service article: "Fraudulent Maneuver"]

[Text] The Washington administration has never given up the tactic of strong-arming the Belgian Government with a view to forcing its junior NATO partner to unconditionally accept U.S. cruise missiles. Through the Atlantic alliance headquarters in Brussels, by means of pressure through diplomatic channels, and with the help of pro-U.S. politicians in the Belgian corridors of power, Washington has been twisting its ally's arm all the time. Nonetheless, Belgium has deferred taking a final decision on the U.S. Euromissiles until the first quarter of this year.

This affront has clearly made Washington pull out all the stops. The report carried by Brussels Radio and the LA CITE newspaper that the Pentagon was planning to secretly transfer components for 48 cruise missiles to the Florennes Belgian Airforce base came as a bombshell. To later assemble the missiles locally presents no difficulty. The Americans will bring in the contraband goods from 15 through 31 January aboard their Galaxy military transports. The operation has been code-named "Wintex-Simpex."

The sensational disclosure of the transatlantic military's devious maneuver has met with angry indignation within Belgian public circles. This step is seen as the continuation of the "faits accomplis" tactic and is being paralleled with the previous behind-the-scenes deal with the United States when, unbeknownst to Parliament, a memorandum was signed in an atmosphere of secrecy. It gave the go-ahead for preparatory work at Florennes and opened the floodgates for uniformed visitors from overseas.

In Belgium an active front has been formed of people opposed to the Eurostrategic weapons from the United States, which are seen here as a direct threat to the country's national security. In a public opinion poll four-fifths of Belgium's population rejected the prospects of becoming a nuclear hostage of the Pentagon.

POLL SHOWS BELGIANS AGAINST MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

LD122354 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] Brussels January 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev reports:

The plans of the United States and NATO to deploy 40 U.S. cruise missiles on Belgium's territory cause a profound anxiety of the Belgian population.

The results of the public opinion poll published by the newspaper LA BELGIQUE on the eve of the official visit of Prime Minister Wilfried Martens and Minister of External Relations Leo Tindemans to the United States show that most of the Belgians declare against the deployment of U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons on Belgium's territory. Many of the people polled declared in favour of the government's putting off indefinitely the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles at the air base in Florennes.

The United States anti-war movement comes out in support of Belgium's progressive organizations. "Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament" and many other U.S. organizations urged Wilfried Martens and Leo Tindemans to say "no" to dangerous designs of the U.S. Administration. The U.S. anti-war movement jointly with the Belgian National Committee of Actions for Peace and Development and the Flemish Committee of Actions Against Nuclear Weapons issued an appeal which emphasizes a serious danger for peace of the implementation of NATO 's nuclear missile plans. "Unless we destroy cruise missiles, they might destroy us", the appeal says.

U.S. 'NUCLEAR MINES' IN FRG DRAW PROTESTS

PM111256 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Ye. Korolev dispatch: "Consent Without Agreement"]

[Text] Bonn -- Special U.S. Army subunits have been issued with portable nuclear mines intended for use behind enemy lines.

More than 100 of these mines are held in particular by one of the U.S. battalions stationed in the region of Bad Toelz in Bavaria. This report has generated a wave of alarm and protest from the FRG public. Social Democratic Party [SPD] Bundestag Deputy Hermann Scheer stated in Bonn that the FRG Government should demand the immediate removal of these mines from the country.

The siting of the mines of FRG territory was termed "monstrous" both politically and militarily by SPD Bundestag Deputy Norbert Haensel. Even the mere presence of the mines, in his words, removes the threshold between conventional and nuclear weapons.

In a question to the government both SPD representatives demanded answers as to whether the FRG Government consented to the deployment of the mines and what measures it intends to take in order to remove them. At the same time an official government spokesman, inundated with questions from journalists, preferred to avoid giving a reply. As one Western correspondent put it, once again the Americans have obtained consent without agreement.

FRG Creating Confusion

DW110959 Moscow International Service in German 1600 GMT 10 Jan 85

[Vladimir Ostrogorskiy commentary]

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen, the report that U.S. troops in the FRG are equipped with portable nuclear weapons has triggered a vehement discussion in the FRG. Vladimir Ostrogorskiy comments:

The FRG Government's official spokesman presents a new story every day that is different from the preceding one. As late as Monday it was being said that Bonn did not know anything about portable nuclear weapons because the Americans are not obligated to report to the Federal Government. On Monday [as heard] things already sounding different, of course it was said, Bonn was informed about everything, including the portable nuclear bombs that can be carried by single individuals. However, on Wednesday it was said: Well, there are portable nuclear bombs, but such bombs can only be carried by several persons because one person alone was not able to.

It is now absolutely certain that the confusion is deliberately contrived, it is to serve as camouflage so that the Americans can safely cram the FRG with additional nuclear explosives such as portable nuclear bombs, nuclear missiles, and other weapons.

However, the disclosure of another detail about the U.S. nuclear plans for the FRG has quite understandably caused consternation among responsible politicians in Bonn, because the portable nuclear weapons of the U.S. troops in the FRG constitute a direct nuclear threat to the FRG. These weapons demonstrate that with Bonn's knowledge and blessing the FRG's fate is not dependent solely on the U.S. President and the NATO generals because it is not they alone who have decision-making power over U.S. strategic and Eurostrategic nuclear weapons. AACHENER VOLKSZEITUNG rightly notes that the decision on the use of nuclear weapons is basically up to any U.S. soldier, who is allowed to act as a god of war in the FRG. Things have gone that far.

The Springer paper DIE WELT does not see anything extraordinary about this. After all, DIE WELT says with pretended innocence, the Americans are not silly. They will not detonate their nuclear bombs in a densely populated country such as the FRG. [Words indistinct] what the Paris paper LE MONDE recently reported, that the U.S. military's special units, the so-called Green Berets and the leathernecks, are armed with these portable nuclear bombs, that weigh only 26 kg each.

There is certainly no need to recall what these fellows are able to do. Their crimes in Vietnam and Grenada will never be forgotten. By the way, what does densely populated actually mean? Just think of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and of the barbaric and, from a military-strategic standpoint, absolutely senseless destruction of Dresden, Hamburg, and a number of other German cities at the end of World War II.

COMMENTARY ON POISONOUS GAS LEAK IN SWEDEN

LD112235 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Victor Olin commentary]

[Text] A leak of poisonous gas has occurred at the chemical plant in the Swedish city of Karlskoga, 240 km west of Stockholm. Radio Moscow's Viktor Olin makes the following comment:

The accident took place at the factory belonging to the munitions company Bofors. The alarm was spread only 40 minutes after a damaged tank began leaking. The factory was enveloped in a white cloud of poisonous gas. Poor visibility and the danger of a blast made it difficult to stop the leak. Though the personnel was evacuated on time, the first aid center set up to deal with the emergency soon began admitting patients with symptoms of poisoning. Experts believe that if the concentration of the leaked gas was high there may be fatalities.

The disaster at the munitions factory in Karlskoga may cause a tragedy similar to that in the Indian city of Bhopal. There 2,500 people died and over 200,000 suffered damage to their health when a leak of highly poisonous gas occurred early last month at the factory belonging to the American corporation Union Carbide. Despite being different in scale, the two accidents have something in common. They are a stern warning that the world is under a chemical threat. For example, the United States is known to have enough chemical weapons to kill the world's population 50 times over. Any incident involving such weapons might result in a tragedy. Therefore every country that has United States chemical weapon stores on her territory is under a great threat.

That this threat is real is confirmed in a recent report by a group of American scientists and technicians. The report points to the growing number of cases in which chemicals are leaked from American stores in Western Europe. Many of the American chemical warheads are fixed on artillery and mortar shells, air bombs and missiles. If one such weapons were set off or merely damaged by accident, it might trigger a chain reaction to claim a great many lives in densely populated areas like Western Europe.

This shows the need not only to renounce further chemical buildup, but to ban and eliminate all chemical weapons as well. According to the above report, this would involve huge expenses and overcoming sizable technical problems. But according to the writers of the report, the end in this case would justify the means. That this is true is seen in the events in Bhopal, Karlskoga and other places where people have suffered from leaks of chemicals. These events, which occurred in peacetime, should be seen as a kind of warning that chemical weapons would cause a far greater tragedy in wartime, and that most of the victims would be civilians.

As for the Soviet Union, it has worked consistently for a verifiable ban on and elimination of chemical weapons.

SOVIET-FINNISH COOPERATION TALKS END IN HELSINKI

PM141000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Ties"]

[Text] The standing Soviet-Finnish intergovernmental Commission for Economic Cooperation ended its 30th meeting here today with the signing of a final protocol. The delegations to the meeting were led by I.V. Arkhipov, chairman of the Soviet part of the commission and first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and Kalevi Sorsa, chairman of the Finnish part of the commission and prime minister of Finland.

The commission reviewed the progress of the implementation of a 5-year trade agreement, covering the years 1981 through 1985, and a long-term program for developing and deepening trade, economic, industrial, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and Finland. Special attention was paid to ways of expanding cooperation in the construction and reconstruction of industrial facilities and in the manufacture of products.

As the intergovernmental commission held its meeting, Soviet foreign trade organizations and Finnish firms signed a number of new agreements and contracts in the chemical, pulp-and-paper and ship-building industries and other fields.

NATO PRESSURING SPAIN INTO ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

LD122129 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2000 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Yaroslav Khabarov Commentary]

[Text] In analyzing Hispano-U.S. relations, El PAIS says that they respond to the role that Washingon and its Atlantic allies assign to Spain in NATO: the strengthening of the community's Mediterranean flank. Our observer Yaroslav Khabarov writes:

In the United States they believe that Spain's European vocation consists of Madrid's most active participation in the implementation of Atlantist policy, including the militarist policy. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger spoke about this at the Madrid negotiations. Such recognition was advocated by the U.S. military representatives at the sessions of the Joint Military Committee that took place under the chairmanship of Admiral Angel Liberal Lucini, chief of the staff of the Spanish Army. In Washington they are saying that Spain's integration into the NATO military structure responds precisely to its Eurppean vocation and that at the same time the Pentagon bases on Spanish territory reinforce NATO's military redoubts in the Mediterranean from this the following conclusion is drawn: It is necessary to modernize by all possible means the four U.S. military bases in Spain and guarantee the United States the possibility of using them to the maximum in the event of critical situations in the Middle East, North Africa, and the Persian Gulf regions. More frequently now, mention is made of the Rapid Deployment Forces which according to the Pentagon should be stationed in Spain.

As is known, the new Hispano-U.S. military agreement to some extent regulates flights by U.S. military aircraft in Spanish airspace. However, in each case it will be necessary to agree with the Americans on the regulations on flights ratified by the prime minister's office. This means that Spain, according to the development of the international situation, will on each occasion be subjected to pressure from the United States. However, there is another side to the coin, writes Yaroslav Khabarov. According to the agreement Washington cannot site, as it might want to, nuclear weapons in Spain. However, as the Spanish press emphasizes, the possibility of U.S. nuclear weapons appearing there is not being ruled out, above all when Spain has joined the NATO military structure, toward which Washington is actively pushing the Madrid government. Observers stress that bloc discipline will inevitably come into effect, and this will be a powerful lever for breaking any possible resistance by the Spanish and to impose up on them the nuclear decision that suits Washington and NATO.

According to the agreement, Washington reserves the right to use its four bases for 5 years, but now there is talk of creating new military bases on Spanish territory. This is what Washington and NATO aim to obtain from the prime mimister's office. The press says that the socialist government has at its disposal NATO documents envisaging the construction of a military base in the Canaries, a naval base in Galicia, docks for submarines in Cartagena, and the modernization of the base in Rota, which the submarines of the U.S. 6th Fleet are ready to visit again. These reports have given rise to the justified alarm of Spanish public opinion which is demanding an end to the foreign military presence on Spanish soil.

NEW FOUNDATION TO INCREASE LISBON'S DEPENDENCE

LD111742 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Lisbon January 11 TASS -- The opinion of local observers is that the activities of the so-called Portuguese-American Foundation which has been set up by the governments of the two countries will inevitably lead to a further increase in Portugal's dependence on the United States in the military, economic and political fields. The officially announced goal of the newly-founded organization is to modernize the Portuguese economy, to increase U.S. investments in Portugal and to found new companies with mixed capital. Washington undertakes to grant 280 million dollars to the Portuguese authorities in the course of seven years in the form of "financial aid."

The foundation has been set up in exchange for Lisbon's granting a right to the Pentagon to build a powerful radar station in Portugal's south to track artificial objects in outer space. The true aims of the newly-established foundation is revealed by the fact that its consultative council will be headed by Carlucci, former U.S. ambassador to Portugal, who is notorious for his flagrant interference in the country's internal affairs in the period following the triumph of the democratic revolution of 1974.

TURKISH MINISTER AGAINST MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

LD111954 Moscow In Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Dispatch from our Ankara correspondent, Anatoliy Koritskiy:

Turkish political circles believe that the statement made by Turkish Foreign Minister Vahit Halefoglu to a Kuwait paper, that is, the statement that Turkey will not permit anybody to deploy any kind of missiles on Turkish territory, will provide food for thought for certain gentlemen in NATO uniforms.

The nonsensical utterances of a NATO strategist by the name of (Konrad Freitag) are remembered by many people. With the candor characteristic of a blunt soldier, (Konrad Freitag) described the eastern region of Turkey as an ideal location for the deployment of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles, as it shares a border with the Soviet Union. He expressed the belief that this region is very suitable for a limited nuclear war compared with densly populated NATO member-countries in West Europe. As is known, this cold-blooded [words indistinct] gave rise to intense anger in Turkey. The press pointed out that the West regards Turkey not as an ally but as an easily managable extension which, if the need arises, can be sacrificed in a nuclear holocaust.

The repercussions in Turkish social circles of such views and the statements by official Turkish representatives show that Ankara decisively rejects the plans for deploying Pershing and cruise missiles on Turkish territory, plans that can only trample Turkey's authority and national interests underfoot.

SALVADORAN REVOLUTIONARIES GIVE PRESS CONFERENCE

LD112346 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jan 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by B. Parkhomenko]

[Text] A press conference of a delegation of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front and of the Revolutionary Democratic Front of El Salvador took place in Moscow today.

The members of the delegation told of the courageous and unyielding struggle being waged in exceptionally difficult and adverse conditions by the El Salvador patriots against the reactionary Duarte regime and U.S. military interference, for the democratization and complete freedom and independence of their country. This is what Enrique Guatemala, the delegation leader, stated:

[Guatemala in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation] The combat successes of the patriotic forces have become that indisputable, decisive factor forcing the government to hold talks on a political solution of the situation that has arisen in the country. Politically and militarily speaking, we control one-fifth of the country and our armed formations carry out operations on 80 percent of El Salvador's territory. Last year we put some 22,000 soldiers and officers of the regime out of action.

At the same time the sociopolitical crisis is deepening in the country. More and more new sections of El Salvador society are going over to the ranks of the opposition. Even the Catholic Church is more and more openly coming out on the side of the opponents of the regime. The working class and trade union movement in defense of the working people's rights and civil liberties is growing stronger. A powerful movement of international solidarity with the El Salvador patriots' struggle is on our side. Our people want peace, Enrique Guatemala said in conclusion; however, the struggle will continue as long as our national sovereignty depends on American imperialism and as long as the death squads exist; that is, as long as the causes that provoked the war exist. We will gather strength, widen our influence, and prepare for decisive battles. Our strength is the main factor that can force the government to hold a just and fruitful dialogue with us.

[Parkhomenko] At the end of the press conference the members of the El Salvador delegation replied to the journalists' numerous questions.

CASTRO GIVES SPEECH ON C. AMERICAN SITUATION

LD121927 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] Managua January 12 TASS -- The urgency of a peaceful settlement of the explosive crisis in Central America and the Caribbean has been pointed out by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of Cuba. He spoke at the ceremony of the presentation to him of the highest governmental award of Nicaragua, the Order of Augusto Cesar Sandino held at a mass meeting on the occasion of the inauguration near Managua of a large sugar refinery built with the assistance of socialist Cuba. Fidel Castro stressed that all countries of the region, including Cuba, are interested in the peaceful settlement.

Mankind needs peace now as never before, the Cuban leader said. Solution of international problems by military force is unthinkable in the present epoch with its destructive weapons.

Peoples of the world are well aware that a new world war will mean an end to civilization. Therefore the entire international public received with profound satisfaction reports on the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva and the joint Soviet-American statement. The Geneva document proclaims for the first time complete elimination of nuclear arms as the ultimate goal. This fact has been approved by all states.

The Cuban leader spoke highly of the activity of Latin American states -- members of the Contadora Group, aimed at the quest of political solutions of Central American problems. We have informed foreign ministers of member-countries of the Contadora Group of our peaceful stand and striving for cooperation, he said. There is a need of agreement guaranteeing Nicaragua's territorial integrity and security which are threatened as a result of imperialist aggression. We, on our part, are prepared to continue showing good will and promoting progress in this direction. There exists a real opportunity to establish peace and friendship among all Central American and Caribbean countries, including Cuba, as well as between Cuba and the United States.

A U.S. military base is situated on Cuba's territory against the will of the Cuban people, Fidel Castro went on to say. We are pressing for its liquidation by political and legal means. But we are not resorting to the use of arms. We shall return that part of Cuban land by a peaceful way sooner or later.

The United States which fears social and economic transformations in Nicaragua has unleashed a war against it, Fidel Castro said. Thousands of Nicaraguans, mainly unarmed peasants, women, children and old people became its victims. In an effort to justify the aggression against Nicaragua the White House alleges that it "exports" the revolution to other countries of Central America, specifically, to El Salvador. Meanwhile, the struggle of the Salvadoran people and bloody reprisals against patriots of that country were started much earlier than the victory of the revolutions in Cuba and in Nicaragua. The revolutions cannot be exported, neither can they be prevented. This is shown by the historic experience of the revolutionary movements accumulated over centuries.

Fidel Castro expressed a firm confidence that the Nicaraguan people will win the victory in the struggle against the imperialist aggression and will overcome the economic difficulties through which the country is living. The Nicaraguans can always count on solidarity and support of their friends, the Cuban leader said.

AFANASYEV ON IMPROVING DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

PM111601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition pp 2-3

[Academician V. Afanasyev article under the rubric "Questions of Theory": "The Objectives and Tasks of Comprehensively Improving Developed Socialism" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface in original]

[Text] The year 1985 is a noteworthy, crucial year. We have entered the homestretch in the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, which will discuss the results of our progress over the past 5 years and outline the prospects for the next 5-year plan period and the foreseeable future. The congress will adopt a new edition of the CPSU program and amendments to its Rules.

Our cherished goal is communism. We have already traveled far along the long and difficult road to that goal and achieved much in all spheres of public life, but it would be wrong to think that Soviet society, being a society of developed socialism and the highest stage of human civilization today, is perfect. It still has many objective difficulties (and we will have to deal with them in the future). There are also shortcomings and unresolved tasks arising from subjective factors. There are disproportions, shortfalls, contradictions. That is why the PLANNED, COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM IS OUR PARTY'S MAIN STRATEGIC TASK.

This was spoken of at the 26th CPSU Congress, the subsequent Central Committee plenums, especially the one held in June (1983), and Comrade K.U. Chernenko's article "Up to the Demands of Developed Socialism," published in the journal KOMMUNIST. Here it is important to note that improving developed socialism also means REAL PROGRESS TOWARD COMMUNISM. No other path can be taken toward communism, and the party, steadily following Lenin's behests, is indeed following this path. It is proceeding confidently, guided by leading revolutionary teaching, orienting itself toward the ideals of socialism and communism, and studying, generalizing, and utilizing its own experience and that of the fraternal socialist countries and the world communist movement.

Stragegy is a general, very wide-ranging concept. It is usually taken to mean the main thrust, the objective of the communist and workers movement in a historically defined era of social development, or, in V.I. Lenin's words, the "general and basic tasks" of the working class and its party.

What are the basic tasks which the party is resolving in implementing its strategic line -- the line of improving developed socialism? There appear to be three such tasks, or rather, groups of tasks:

1. Tasks which, for whatever reason, were not resolved in the earlier stages of our society's development;

2. Tasks in further strengthening and developing the basic principles of mature socialism, above all the principles of collectivism and social justice;

3. Long-term tasks, whose formulation and resolution "operate" at the stage of improving developed socialism as well as pushing society along the path toward communism. We must all live not only for today, but for tomorrow, it was noted at the CPSU Central Committee October (1984) Plenum.

All these three types, three groups of tasks are organically interconnected and united. The resolution of the tasks of the past, so to speak, creates the prerequisites for the resolution of the problems of the present, which in turn creates the basis for the formulation and attainment of long-term objectives.

There is a single axis, a single pivot, a basis which determines success in the resolution of all our tasks, without exception. This is WORK, persistent, conscientious, creative work; tireless LABOR, daily, efficient, well organized labor; ACTION carried out with the highest degree of discipline and responsibility. Work, labor, responsibility by everyone, whatever post he holds -- from the worker to the minister. Working better and more fruitfully today than yesterday, working better tomorrow than today -- that is the key to the resolution of the tasks of the past, present, and future.

Now for a more detailed look at the types of tasks listed, whose resolution constitutes the implementation of the party's strategy for improving developed socialism.

First, the TASKS FROM THE PAST which we were unable to fulfill at various stages of the first phase of the communist formation. These tasks are most evident in the economy. We have not yet achieved the highest labor productivity, since alongside the modern machinery and technology, our economy also has many obsolete machines and items of equipment, and not all our people are notable for their conscientious, highly productive labor using their strength and knowledge to the full. We have still not rid ourselves of a considerable proportion of manual, heavy, and unskilled labor, which has remained somewhere around the 40 percent level for decades now, and the food program has not been entirely resolved (the USSR food program is aimed at resolving it).

We have much to do in the sociopolitical sphere, and particularly in the sphere of spiritual life and education. There are vestiges of the past in people's consciousness and behavior, antisocial phenomena and criminality, and manifestations of nationalism and local narrowmindedness. We inherited some of these extremely undesirable phenomena from the past, while others we ourselves "caught" because of violations, in some places, of the principles of socialism, shortcomings in education, and so forth.

The means of resolving these tasks are criticism and self-criticism, the prompt exposure and eradication of shortcomings, and the improvement of the level of discipline, organization, and responsibility. The party consistently comes out in favor of developing principled criticism still more widely and resolutely, cutting short any attempts to suppress it, and especially to persecute people for criticism. Naturally, this does not mean that criticism and self-criticism are any less relevant in resolving today's tasks and, in particular, the tasks of the future. Here too we need these tried and tested party tools, but they increasingly take the form of debates, discussions, the discovery and comparison of different opinions, viewpoints, and options, their evluation, and the selection of the best. To put it more simply, the resolution of tasks remaining from the past is a matter of "pulling up the rearguard" to the level of present-day requirements.

The range of tasks which are directly oriented TOWARD PERFECTING AND IMPROVING THE PARAMETERS, PRINCIPLES, AND QUALITIES OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM PROPER is far wider, deeper, and more diverse. We have a mighty production network which accords fundamentally with the demands of developed socialism, but it needs further improvement and development. Hence the need to modernize enterprises on an up-to-date scientific, technical, and technological basis. But this is not yet taking place up to the standard of party requirements everywhere or always.

Another example. Equality, social justice, and collectivism are immutable principles of our society. They are predominant in our country, we cannot imagine life without them. But here too we have room for improvement, especially as in some places these principles are frankly violated. We could not claim, for instance, that the system of material and moral incentives for labor is ideal. Otherwise, where do those people come from who are able to work less and get more, where does unearned income come from, why do some of our people live beyond their means, where does parasitism come from?

The most important thing for today is to preserve and augment the positive developments in industry, agriculture, transport, education, and the cultural and consumer sphere which have taken place in recent years. I refer to the increase in the rate of development of production and labor productivity, the improvement in the state of affairs in livestock raising, the acceleration of social construction in the countryside, new successes in the sphere of science and technology, and so forth. These developments are the result not so much of the increase in capital investments or of any radical transformations, as of the party's efforts to impose order in our large, complex economy and its resolute opposition to negative phenomena hampering our progress. A series of measures have been taken to increase the level of people's organization, discipline, and responsibility. These measures are understood and unconditionally approved and supported by the people.

And, lastly, the LONG-TERM tasks. These are the tasks for tomorrow, but the foundations for resolving them are laid today. We have spoken, for instance, of the modernization of production, but modernizing means improving what is, what laready exists. However, that is not enough for progress toward communism, for the creation of its material and technical base. Hence the need for fundamentally new, truly revolutionary technical and technological solutions to increase labor productivity sharply, many times over, and to improve output quality. Hence the need to create production facilities which are science-intensive but require less in the way of materials and energy, conserve labor, and eliminate manual work, especially heavy, monotonous work. It is a question of automation based on the achievements of microelectronics, flexible production facilities capable of switching over rapidly to the manufacture of something new, universal processing centers and robot engineering, the mastery of nuclear fusion, bioengineering, information science, genetic engineering, and waste-free production facilities which not only save materials and energy, but are up to the highest ecological requirements.

Something similar is taking place in education and the molding of the new person. We are called upon today to measure people not only by today's yardsticks, but by TOMORROW'S, to raise and educate them in accordance with the high communist ideals. The "ultimate goal" for communism, as K. Marx himself noted, is man, comprehensively and harmoniously developed man. We must move toward attaining this goal consistently, taking into account the fact that man's consciousness is a fortress won day by day, step by step.

The fundamental basis of society's development and the main sphere of rivalry and struggle between the two opposing social systems -- socialism and capitalism -- is the ECONOMY and PRODUCTION. Hence, the improvement of the society of developed socialism takes the form, first and foremost, of the improvement of production. Here the general line is INTENSIFICATION. Only by means of intensification is it possible to resolve such a major, fundamental task as that of bringing the country up to the world's highest level of labor productivity.

Intensification is the transition from quantitative forms in production (the growth of production capacities chiefly on the basis of existing technology, the increase in the number of workers) to QUALITATIVE forms (a fundamentally new technical and technological base, improved organization of labor and management, highly skilled workers). The intensification of production, put simply, means the manufacture in the shortest possible time, in the smallest possible production area, for the minimum expenditure of manpower and material resources and finance, of a larger quantity of output, and -- most important -- better quality output. Produce faster, cheaper, to a higher standard of quality -- that is the watchword in intensification.

In the language of philosophy, the innermost nature of intensification is TIME-SAVINGS. This is an important indicator of progress for society and for man. "Both for the individual and for society," K. Marx worte, "all-around development, consumption, and activity depend on saving time. All thrift amounts ultimately to the saving of time" (K. Marx and F. Engels Archives, Vol 4, p 119).

The time factor was valued extremely highly by V.I. Lenin. He demanded that time be saved in big matters and small, in labor and daily life, because he saw that without saving time it was impossible to eliminate Russia's backwardness and win the battle against capitalism in the sphere of the economy and culture. "...To gain time," V.I. Lenin said, "is to gain everything..." ("Complete Collected Works," Vol 44, p 50).

Why is this so? Why does all thrift ultimately amount to the saving of time? Why does the degree of time-saving serve as an important indicator of social progress and of the comprehensiveness of the development of society as a whole and of each individual? Primarily because society's material and spiritual potential is determined by the level of development of its productive forces and this level, in turn, is measured by the quantity and quality of the material and spiritual assets created by society in any unit of time. Time means peace, rhythm, and speed. And the faster the pace, the quicker the rhythm; the greater the speed, the more expansive and meaningful time becomes and the more significant each unit of time becomes because in these circumstances, man and society will produce more and achieve more.

Various indicators are customarily used as measures of the efficiency of a given social system: deadlines for completing a task, deadlines for recovering outlay, the scale of material and other costs, and so forth. When dealing with deadlines, time serves as a direct measure of efficiency; when dealing with material costs, it serves as the ultimate indicator because material assets include a certain amount of time spent on their production.

The more "concentrated" a unit of time and the greater the quantity of material and spiritual assets produced within it, the higher the the level of development will be of production, society, and, together with society, of each individual. This is the general formula reflecting the link between social progress and the degree of time-saving. However, a high level of production and a high degree of time-saving are essential but by no means enough to ensure the comprehensive development of society and the individual. The main thing is to ensure that the material and spiritual assets produced become the property of all society and of all its members without exception.

The developed capitalist countries produce many valuable assets, particularly material assets, but what good is that to the vast mass of working people deprived of the opportunity of enjoying to the full the benefits which they themselves produce? Even under capitalism, of course, time-saving can lead to a rise in working people's living standards as a result of their intensive class struggle.

In the capitalist world, however, time-saving serves primarily as a means of increasing exploitation. Working people save time but a considerable proportion of the fruits of this saving are enjoyed by capital and the powers that be. It is natural that the degree of time-saving under capitalism as an indicator of the level of development of material production should tell us virtually nothing about the comprehensiveness of the development of society as a whole, even less of the individual person. It is no coincidence that K. Marx identifies the principle of time-saving as a criterion of social progress with the collective production inherent in socialism and communism. Furthermore, he characterized time-saving as the first economic law of this form of production.

It is important to note that time-saving is not just the first economic law but also the first sociological law of the functioning and development of socialism and communism because the comprehensiveness of social progress means a high level both of production and the entire system of social relations and of spiritual culture, just as the comprehensiveness of man's development includes the whole range of his qualities as a producer, a member of society, a conscious, thinking being, and a bearer and creator of moral, aesthetic, and other spiritual values.

When speaking about time-saving as an indicator of the comprehensiveness of an individual's development, we must keep in mind not just work time but also leisure time. Working people need leisure time for education, intellectual development, the performance of social functions, contact with comrades, and the free play of physical and intellectual forces. The saving or economizing of time, the increasing of leisure time, and the rational use of time for the benefit of man and society are both the essence and main thrust of the intensification of social production and of society's progress as a whole.

In our opinion there are three basic factors of intensification:

1. The scientific and technical revolution and the speediest and most efficient use of its latest achievements in the national economy and throughout social like;

2. the improvement of the economic mechanism of the entire system of management of the econony and other spheres of our society's life;

3. improving the working people's education and skills, since the future of our plans, our economy, and our entire society depends to a decisive degree on people, on their skills and their education, on how they are distributed among the various cells of the social organism, on how well they collaborate, and on how responsible and disciplined they are.

Among all these factors, I would like to draw attention to the special importance of improving THE ECONOMIC MACHINERY AND THE ENTIRE SYSTEM OF MANAGEMENT. That is because it is necessary to skillfully manage scientific and technical progress and the training of working people and improvement of their education and skills.

It is well known that the scientific and technical revolution offers tremendous, really inexhaustible sources and reserves for boosting production and improving its efficiency and labor productivity. But, to be frank, the modern achievements of science and technology are not yet sufficiently utilized, and sometimes downright poor use is made of them. The reason for this lies largely in the inadequacy of management and the economic machinery, especially the system of material and moral incentives; in the inadequacy of indicators for planning and assessing the results of work at enterprises, associations, and ministries.

The main plan and report indicator is still gross output, the volume of output sales in rubles. Although for many years now attempts have been to make volume and cost indicators accounting indicators only, their role in assessing the work of economic components is still dominant.

Much has been said and written about the drawbacks of volume and cost indicators -- they cause expensive articles to be created. Indeed, it is on the volume of sales in rubles that the number of working people, labor productivity, the wage and bonus fund, and so forth depend. This is one reason for the shortage of a number of articles which are cheap, but essential to man and society.

What is the solution? The 26th CPSU Congress indicated the need to elaborate a SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC INDICATORS, but our economists have not done that this year. Obvious candidates for this system are indicators reflecting the actual contribution of every enterprise, association, and ministry to increasing public wealth and fulfillment of the catalog (the actual list of articles), plan, and contract commitments. All these indicators are very, very important. A shortfall in the supply of some small, cheap parts results in the nonfulfillment of plans, sometimes by a large number of allied enterprises, and a failure to fulfill trade commitments results in shortages and a failure to supply enough goods to match incomes. But it is particularly important to ensure that CONSUMER VALUE -- how useful and necessary an article is to people and society -- takes precedence over the cost approach. People need useful, high-quality goods that can satisfy their needs rather than expensive articles.

A major economic experiment is currently being conducted in the country. The aim of it is to increase, on the one hand, the INDEPENDENCE and, on the other hand, the RESPONSIBILITY of the collective and enterprises' leaders for the job. The experiment has already been in operation in 5 different ministries (union and republican), and this year they will be joined by another 31 ministries and departments. The economic experiment is being extended and is already producing positive results, but it has also created problems and questions which need to be further tackled by planning and economic organs.

It is also necessary to learn how to skillfully regulate, on a scientific basis, the improvement of the standard of working people's education and skills. As is known, equipment and technology are developing rapidly, whereas in some cases the training of specialists, workers, and leaders capable of mastering them falls short of modern requirements. As a rule, we train specialist engineers and designers who know their own relatively small sphere of work. Modern production, however, requires BROADLY skilled specialists who are well versed in the scientific and technical and technological principles of modern production, people who are mobile and capable of quickly learning new skills and mastering the latest methods of designing and manufacturing the most up-to-date types of articles. What I have said also applies to worker. The desire they have expressed to acquire related trades must be given every support.

The main task of the current general and vocational education reform in the country is to provide profound, modern knowledge and multifaceted polytechnical training, to forge a fundamental link between training and production labor, and to prepare the younger generation for work in conditions of rapidly changing equipment and technology -- in other words, in the conditions of today's and tomorrow's production. In short, it is a matter of intensifying and effecting a fundamental, qualitative improvement in education and training. It is compressing the training period, providing young men and women, over the same or a shorter period of time, not only with more knowledge, but with knowledge and skills which are really useful and essential to them and to society.

The improvement of developed socialism embraces not only the economy, but all other spheres of our very complex social organism. In the social sphere, as K.U. Chernenko noted, the party will seek to comprehensively promote the deepening of processes leading to the formation of a classless socialist society and the further flourishing and coming together of nations and to ensure that social relationships everywhere develop in strict accordance with socialism's inherent principle of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

In the political sphere the chief objective is the full implementation of SOCIALIST SELF-MANAGEMENT by the people, which is the kind of democratic system for running the affairs of society and the state that, according to V.I. Lenin, operates not only for working people, but through the working people themselves.

The formation of socialist self-management by the people presupposes the further strengthening of the Soviet state and society's entire political system and the development and deepening of socialist democracy in order to ensure in the future the direct involvement of EACH AND EVERYONE in the running of society and state, the ever fuller implementation by soviets, labor collectives, and all other components of the socialist democracy system of the broad rights they have been given, their heightened creative activity, and the exploitation of proven and the search for new, more effective and efficient forms of work.

In the sphere of SPIRITUAL LIFE the increasingly intensive improvement of citizens' knowledge, culture, and awareness must continue, as must the improvement and refinement of ideological and theoretical work, to ensure that all working people assimilate the party's deeply creative conclusions and guidelines. It is to these conclusions and guidelines that our party is orienting public consciousness.

The guarantee of the success of the big and complex task of improving the developed socialist society is the CPSU's leadership of the economy and all spheres of our life. The CPSU is the ruling party and has final responsibility for everyone and everything. It uses its own specific methods and means of performing its directing role. They are, as K.U. Chernenko noted, methods of exercising political influence on the development of the economy, social relations, democracy, and culture, methods of persuading, organizing, and educating the masses. It is through the study of key spheres of economic and social policy, through MONITORING ITS IMPLEMENTATION and through COMMUNIST CADRES operating in all areas of socialist building that the party performs its leading role.

Under the CPSU's leadership the Soviet people are successfully solving and will continue to solve the big and complex tasks facing the country.

OFFICIALS DISCUSS IDEOLOGICAL WORK CONFERENCE

OW121159 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0630 GMT 3 Jan 85

[From the "Lenin's University of the Millions" program, with V.F. Pravotorov, section chief at the Propaganda Department of the party Central Committee; V.N. Ivanov, director of the Sociological Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and V.I. Yelkov, secretary of the party committee at a machine-building plant in Demikhovo, Moscow Oblast, discussing issues discussed at the all-union conference on improving developed socialism, and the ideological work of the party in light of the resolutions of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum]

[Excerpt] [Ivanov] I would like to talk about another point, our work, and the research carried out in the interests of counterpropaganda.

We have not yet talked about that today, but this is not because the issue was not mentioned at the conference ...

[Pravotorov] And in Konstantin Ustinovich's speech, and Mikhail Sergeyevich's report...

[Ivanov] It was often mentioned, and received considerable attention in may speeches. I would like to say that the collective of our institute has greatly intensified its activity in this field lately, both in the field of analysis of the content and methods of hostile propaganda and in that of determining the degree of readiness of various groups of the population, especially young people, to this ideological opposition. We are arming our ideological cadres with appropriate counterarguments in the struggle against our class enemy, so that he may not, using the words of Mikhail Vasilyevich [as heard], who spoke about the aspiration of the class enemy, push us into defensive positions. So that this does not happen, our counterpropaganda must be sufficiently operative and convincing. Very much depends on scientists in this field, of course. Our replies contain a concrete charge which makes it possible to literally seize our enemy by the neck and tell him this is a lie, an exaggeration, and so forth.

[Pravotorov] Vilen Nikolayevich, in addition to these problems, is there anything else interesting, like demography for instance? I know that your institute deals with that.

[Ivanov] Yes, there is. We have now carried out very large-scale research on demographic behavior in various regions of our country. For the first time, we sent a sociological expedition to regions inhabited by small minorities in the far north. Very interesting results have been obtained, and we are now processing them. We have sent some data and analytical notes to the RSFSR Gosplan and Council of Ministers.

[Pravotorov] With specific suggestions?

[Ivanov] Yes, with specific suggestions. This trend is developing fairly quickly at our place. I must also speak about the research we conduct in the field of problems of development in the social structure of our society, social planning, social forecasting. This has also been considerably intensified. Books, including good ones on problems of social forecasting, have been published.

[Pravotorv] Individual or collective?

[Ivanov] Indivudual, and some collective, articles. Our other authors have also increased their activity since the June plenum.

[Pravotorv] In other words, you feel that, since the June plenum, in response to the criticism voiced there, it is now possible to say that there is something to show, that something substantial has been achieved, though, for science, 18 months may be a short period?

[Ivanov] Yes, today we can say, with full justification, that the reorganization now being conducted at the institute is producing results.

[Pravotorov] The conference was a significant, and interesting, event and all the participants in our discussion have practically confirmed this.

Yet, the tasks it has set, for the ideological workers, the entire party, and economic front workers, were on a larger scale, and for a long time they will continue to receive special attention. The important and long-term task, like the reorientation of public consciousness on major problems in perfecting developed socialism, will undoubtedly continue to receive the special attention of the party's ideological cadres, the party, and the people.

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW KOMSOMOL CONFERENCE

LD121917 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Summary] A conference of the Moscow city Komsomol organization took place today.

"Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, who spoke at the conference, passed on to its participants Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko's greetings and best wishes."

Comrade Mishin, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, took part in the conference.

SHCHERBITSKIY ADDRESSES UKRAINE PARTY SECRETARIES

LD121314 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Excerpt] Secretaries of primary party organizations of the Ukrainian capital discussed today the tasks of Kiev's party organization for the fulfillment of plans and pledges for the current year in light of the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. Comrade Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee, delivered an introductory speech to them.

AFP: FRG INTELLIGENCE SOURCES ON KGB DEFECTOR

NC111302 Paris AFP in English 1259 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Bonn, Jan 11 (AFP) -- A colonel in the KGB, the Soviet secret police, fled to the West last summer with secrets of the Soviet spy centre's headquarters in Moscow, intelligence sources said today. They were commenting on fragmentary reports appearing in today's KOELNISCHER-BONNER RUNDSCHAU daily newspaper.

The KGB colonel was the most senior Soviet officer to work with the West German Bundesnachtrichtendienst (BND) "in many years," the sources said.

He entered a West German Embassy in the country in which he was based and sought, and received, political asylum. The sources did not name the country. The BND is closely guarding his present whereabouts, as well as his identity. They said he had given secrets concerning the KGB headquarters in Moscow, but that he had not named any KGB members in the West.

The daily newspaper likened this case with that of Soviet Colonel Oleg Penkowski who spied for the West for many years until he was executed in 1963.

RSFSR MINISTERS APPROVE NATURE PROTECTION PLAN

LD111425 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0909 GMT 11 Jan 85

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jan (TASS) -- A comprehensive scheme for the protection of nature in the zone of the Baykal-Amur Railway has been approved by the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium. In today's issue, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA says that the plan, which covers the period up to the year 2000, sets out the main guidelines for the economic and social development of the zone which covers 1.6 million square km and stretches over 3,000 km from east to west. If consistently implemented, the proposed system of measures will make it possible to create appropriate ecological conditions for the development of public-sector production and the normal life of the population. Preservation and rational use of the natural environment, including the entire range of questions related to the life of the northern peoples, will be guaranteed.

For the first time plans for protection of nature and the siting and development of industry in this extensive area are being drawn up in parallel so that they complement each other, the paper writes. Analysis of the region's natural and resource potential has already been carried out. The existing state of the environment has been evaluated. Maximum permissible limits on its exploitation have been assessed. Recommendations for use of nature and restrictions upon it have been outlined. These make allowance for the maximum possible economic development of the zone.

RSFSR PROCUREMENT, CINEMATOGRAPHY HEADS REPLACED

PM111545 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Jan 85 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Diary"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Nikolay Yakovlevich Golub RSFSR minister of procurement.

Comrade P.I. Merkulov has been released from the post of RSFSR minister of procurement in connection with his retirement. The RSFSR Council of Ministers thanked Comrade Pavel Ivanovich Merkulov for his long and fruitful service.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Nikolay Yakovlevich Sychev chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Cinematography.

Comrade A.G. Filippov has been released from the post of chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for Cinematography in connection with his retirement. The RSFSR Council of Ministers thanked Comrade Aleksandr Gavrilovich Filippov for his long and fruitful service.

BRIEFS

NEW ESTONIAN PARTY JOURNAL -- The first issue of a sociopolitical journal of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, PULS VREMENI [PULSE OF TIME] has been published in Tallinn. The journal will come out twice a month. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2304 GMT 9 Jan 85 LD]

BAYBAKOV INTERVIEWED ON 1985 ECONOMIC TASKS

PM101350 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 1, 1-6 Jan 85 (Signed to Press 2 Jan 85) pp 4-5

["Topical Interview" with N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, by special correspondents Vladimir Andreyev and Aleksandr Yevseyev: "Portrait of the Year. The Policy Is Intensification!"]

[Text] Question: The topic of our interview, Nikolay Konstantinovich, is 1985. The final year of the 11th 5-Year Plan. But since "year" is rather an arbitrary concept -- the economy and production do not stop and do not develop according to the calendar -- to begin with, would it not make sense to take a look at the year that has just ended to see what it was like for us and our national economy?

Answer: I agree with you. Naturally, economic life does not start anew on 1 January; it continually goes on as one continuous production process. What was last year like? It is in the nature of my work that I find it most convenient to turn to figures. In any event, it will save time. Therefore, allow me to cite some figures illustrating the results of the past year.

Here, then, are the figures: National income -- and this is a most important indicator that gives you an idea of how the country as a whole performed -- increased by 3.1 percent, which is precisely as the plan envisaged. Another most important indicator -- the volume of industrial production -- increased by 4.4. percent (against the 3.8 percent envisaged by the plan). Furthermore, the increase in industrial production in group "B," which produces "goods for everyone," was even higher -- 4.5 percent.

Behind these overall figures lie the increased volumes produced in our economy and the increase in its maturity, flexibility, and ability to resolve pressing national economic tasks.

What is the picture in agriculture? Gross output increased by R10 billion compared with the average annual total in the 10th 5-Year Plan. The 10th 5-Year Plan, that was a long time ago, you may say. All right then, let us see what our results in agriculture look like when compared with 1983. Purchases of livestock products increased last year -- livestock and poultry by 4 percent, milk by 2.3 percent, and eggs by 2.1 percent -- and this is having a favorable impact on the work of the agro-industrial complex' processing sectors and on supplies of meat and dairy products to the population.

The work of transport, both freight and passenger transport, has improved. The plan for the volume of freight turnover has been overfulfilled on all types of transport. There are fewer complaints about railroad transport. And -- as we all remember -- we have witnessed an outstanding event: Operational traffic has opened along the whole route of the Baykal-Amur Railroad.

Question: What can you say about a most important indicator such as labor productivity growth?

Answer: In industry, it exceeded 4 percent, as against the 3.4 percent planned. It is especially pleasing that last year for the first time, labor productivity growth accounted for 93 percent of the increase in industrial output. The largely successful fulfillment by labor collectives of the 1984 pledges adopted in response to the CPSU Central Committee appeal to strive for an above-plan increase in labor productivity and reduction in prime cost considerably contributed to this.

Question: Why is it "especially pleasing" that this "increase" was achieved through labor productivity growth?

Answer: Because the figures that I have quoted indicate that the economy is consistently moving in the direction of production intensification and that, as Comrade K.U. Chernenko observed in his speech at the 15 November 1984 CPSU Central Committee Politburo session, our economy is "step by step approaching the stage where the entire increase in output in the national economy will be accounted for by higher labor productivity." Increasing the number of workers is not a reserve for boosting production volumes that exist in our country. The only means available to us is to increase labor productivity and intensify production. To this end, it is above all necessary to constantly rely on the achievements of scientific and technical progress and to apply them in practice. Last year we built approximately 4,000 models of new types of machinery, equipment, instruments, and means of automation. Targets for the introduction of robots in production and for saturating production with flexible systems, rotary lines [rotornyye linii], and computer systems have been fulfilled and overfulfilled.

Question: How do you assess the situation with respect to the quality of goods?

Answer: Although it is improving, it is by no means as good as it might be. Great complaints can be made about machine builders (especially those who build machinery for the countryside) and metallurgists, because what we need today is not simply metal, not simply rolled metal, but specific types of metal and specific sections of rolled metal, and the plan for these is not always entirely fulfilled. There are also complaints in regard to chemical industry workers, because the dyes and mineral fertilizers they produce do not always meet the current high requirements.

Enterprises producing consumer goods deserve to be criticised especially severely. They must now put more effort into reorganizing their work, aim to produce goods that are in high demand, and follow fashions and all innovations closely.

Question: How successfully is the program for social development outlined by the 26th party congress being implemented?

Answer: The main aim of all our plans is, of course, to enhance the well-being of the Soviet citizens. Here the picture is as follows: Real incomes increased by 3.3 percent against the 3.1 percent envisaged by the 5-year plan for 1984. Average monthly wages of workers and employees and the remuneration of kolkhoz members have increased. Social consumption funds also have increased and total almost R140 billion today. From all sources of finance, 113.7 million square meters of housing were built in 1984 -- 1.3 million square meters more than during the previous year, which, incidentally, was a record year. The housing conditions of approximately 10 million people improved. All these figures accord with or exceed the plan targets. As you can see, on the whole, the results are not bad.

Naturally, not everything went as smoothly as we would have liked. Oil extraction conditions have deteriorated, and our oilmen, who taught us long ago to expect them to exceed their targets year after year, this time failed to fully cope with them.

Supplies of raw materials to industry and of certain goods to trade could not but be affected by the shortfall in agricultural products against the volumes envisaged in the annual and 5-year plans, a shortfall which reflected the extremely unfavorable weather conditions; it was the 4th low-yield year in succession. Up to a point, this is also reflected in this year's plan. However, I repeat, on the whole we are entitled to say that 1984 was a successful year for our economy. We have consolidated and, in a certain sense, augmented the positive trends and shifts that emerged in the work of virtually all national economic sectors in 1983.

Question: Last year a large-scale experiment to expand the economic independence of enterprises was launched in five of the country's ministries: What do the preliminary results indicate?

Answer: Above all, that we must improve the production management system and the entire economic machinery more boldly and on a wider scale. What was done last year is only the beginning. As of 1 January, as you know, a further 21 unions and republic ministries joined in the experiment. In many oblasts, consumer service enterprises are being switched to the new conditions of management. But, of course, this is not all that is involved in the work to improve management methods. We must improve the corresponding mechanisms in construction and design organizations and enhance the financial interests of construction workers in commissioning projects on time. We must adjust the mechanism of collaboration among all the partners in the agro-industrial complex. And we must make wider use of collective forms of labor organization and remuneration in the national economy.

But you asked about the results of the experiment. Well, with reference to the participants themselves, the experiment's positive impact on the results of their economic activity is clearly noticeable. Plan fulfillment as regards one of the main indicators -- output sales taking into account contract commitments -- has improved. The entire increase in output has been achieved through higher labor productivity, and targets for reducing prime costs have been exceeded. Unfortunately, by no means has full use been made of all the potential created by the new management conditions; certain leaders just cannot get used to the new economic "existence" -- they try to work in the new conditions using old and obsolete methods. The experiment also clearly shows those components of our economic work that must be improved in order to exploit all the experiment's latent potential.

Question: Now we can clearly pass on to this year's economic portrait, to the 1985 plan. First of all, its specific features. Speaking at the last USSR Supreme Soviet session, you described 1985 as the "base period for the 12th 5-Year Plan." What did you mean?

Answer: Only that this year creates the economic base, the springboard for the 12th 5-Year Plan. The results of our work in the 11th 5-Year Plan as a whole and the degree of success with which the next 5-year plan begins will largely depend on how this year goes and on the indicators it ends with. This year is the final lap of the 11th 5-Year Plan, and as is known, the final lap always calls for the utmost effort, extreme exertion, total commitment, and the mobilization of all the economic organism's internal resources. I am using sporting terminology, but all this can quite justifiably be applied to the functioning of the economic organism as well. The 1985 plan is primarily oriented toward increasing the intensification of production, enhancing its technical standard, and making maximum use of its production and scientific potential and of all the economy's internal reserves. This has largely determined what you describe as its "economic portrait."

Question: May I ask you to briefly define the concept of intensification?

Answer: Yes, working more intensively means working fruitfully. A definition of intensiveness could be expressed as follows, if you wish: "more with less resources." Greater output with less input. However, that, of course, is an oversimplification: the intensification of the economy is a multifaceted problem. As for the specific tasks that the national economy faces this year, they are as follows: to consolidate and boost the positive trends in economic development that have emerged over the past 2 years. Higher growth rates for general economic indicators than the average annual increases achieved during the past period of the 5-year plan have been set. The absolute increases in national income, agricultural production, and railroad transport freight turnover, as well as in the production of a number of most important types of industrial goods, must be augmented.

At the same time -- and it is important to note this -- almost the entire increase in national income and 95 percent of the increase in industrial production is to be achieved through higher labor productivity. In agriculture and transport, this factor is to account for the entire increase in output.

Question: Does this mean that once again it is a question of boosting the process of the intensification of the national economy?

Answer: Indeed, there is no other way for us, as I have already said. Furthermore, we must secure the entire increase in industrial production at existing enterprises not only without increasing the labor force, but even while slightly reducing it.

Question: How will this actually be done?

Answer: Mainly by implementing the targets for scientific and technical progress. The process of the intensification of production hinges, so to speak, on three key factors: the achievements of scientific and technical progress; improved organization of labor, production, and management; and the complete and efficient utilization of natural, manpower, material, and financial resources. The mainstay of this process is the latest achievements of science and technology, of scientific and technical progress. This is where the biggest reserves lie. What we need is equipment and production techniques capable of sharply increasing social labor productivity. These must, of course, be the best and most advanced machines and production techniques

As you know, the pursuit of intensification is the general line of our economy. It is no accident, of course, that the 1985 plan pays the closest attention to this area: targets have been set for all the main avenues of scientific and technical progress. Thus, it is planned to assimilate 4,200 new types of machines, equipment, instruments, and materials, which is 7.7 percent more than the 1984 plan. At the same time, 2,400 types of outmoded products and obsolete production processes will be taken out of production. That, too, is more than last year. The use of progressive, resource-saving production processes, including continuous casting of steel, the dry method of cement production, the more thorough refining of oil and gas, and the comprehensive utilization of raw materials, is to be extended. Some 800 automated electronic control systems for technological processes and production facilities will come into operation. Some 1,150 computer complexes for controlling machines, equipment, and instruments will appear at enterprises. This is 57 percent more than last year. Thanks to the improved technical standard of production, it is planned to nationally free around 800,000 people in industry this year and to transfer approximately 400,000 workers from manual to mechanized labor, obtaining a saving of around R5 billion through reduced prime costs.

It is also planned to allocate more money than in the past for the development of science, and specifically for fundamental research to create the scientific groundwork for the 12th 5-Year Plan and for the long-term future.

Question: To what areas of the national economy will the new machines primarily be dispatched?

Answer: Their destination will be production facilities and sectors closely connected with the implementation of the targets of the food and energy programs and the introduction of resource-saving production processes. The equipment will be primarily channeled into construction projects scheduled for commissioning in 1985 and into the modernization of existing enterprises.

Question: What is the army of robots like today, and what will it be by the end of the year?

Answer: The production of automatic manipulators (industrial robots) will increase by 14 percent this year and total 14,300 units. This is 30 percent more than envisaged in the 5-year plan and almost 10 times more than in 1980. By the end of the year, the robot pool will total 40,000 units. The annual effect from their application will exceed R200 million and will make it possible to release 60,000 workers.

Question: How will the slogan "The economy must be economical" be reflected in this year's plans?

Answer: First of all, let me say that it is not so much a slogan as a demand, a necessity dictated by life itself. It is an urgent reality of our development. We have now reached such a level in our development, such a gigantic scale in the production of fuel, metal, energy, and other types of output, that to proceed exclusively in the direction of increasing their further production is either extremely complex or uneconomical. Take fuel, for instance. It has been calculated that money spent on saving 1 percent of the fuel we consume is two or three times more effective than if the same funds are invested in fuel extraction and production. Moreover, it must be remembered that today we obtain most of our fuel in Siberia, where production is very costly, and use it, for instance, in the south Ukraine. Just imagine the transportation cost!

The situation is the same with metal: Last year we smelted 153 million metric tons of steel, which is more than anybody else in the world. But here, too, calculations show that the further quantitative buildup of the production of metal products is economically unjustified. For this reason, our plans envisage satisfying the growing needs of the national economy in a different, more economical way, notably by expanding the production of the most economically advantageous types of rolled metal and by enhancing the durability and other consumer qualities of metal.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that more attention is being paid to the policy of saving raw material, fuel and energy, and other material resources in 1985 as an important condition for increased production efficiency and for balancing the needs of the national economy against the available resources. Savings of material resources, as Comrade K.U. Chernenko emphaized in his speech at the 15 November 1984 Politburo session, are becoming an important source of production growth in present-day conditions. This is why concern for saving raw materials, semifinished products, and energy is a task of paramount importance.

This year's plan contains intensive targets for saving motor fuel, electricity, and heat and reducing their comsumption. In our view, special attention must be paid to saving motor fuel. We hope to gain much from the further conversion of the motor vehicle fleet to diesel fuel, especially the truck fleet, which is the country's main fuel consumer. Some vehicles will run on compressed liquefied gas. Unfortunately, this work is still proceeding too slowly...

Question: We rank first in the work in the production of oil, and at the same time, as you said, we are switching part of the motor vehicle fleet to gas. How do you explain this "paradox"?

Answer: There is no paradox here. This is why: Oil has many uses. The oil industry supplies the national economy with fuel and mineral oil and the chemical industry with a valuable raw material. In connection with the considerable increase in the country's fleet of motor vehicles, aircraft, diesel locomotives and diesel plants, requirements are increasing particularly fast.

In connection with the limited possibilities for increasing petroleum extraction, the task has been set of using compressed and liquefied gas more widely in motor transport, which will make it possible to secure a substantial saving in gasoline and oil and, ultimately, in the petroleum from which they are produced and which is so necessary to the chemical industry. Burning petroleum, according to Mendeleyev, is tantamount to burning money. The changeover of motor vehicles to gas is equally important in another way: An engine fueled by gas virtually does not pollute the atmosphere and its service life increases.

That is why the changeover of motor transport to gas is worthwhile and necessary.

Question: Competition is currently developing in the country to create above-plan savings funds in order to work 2 days in the year using saved raw materials, supplies, and fuel. It is known that all this fund's resources will be spent on social needs, particularly health care. Has anybody calculated how much these savings will amount to?

Answer: Indeed, the estimate is that the total amount of material expenditure on these 2 days will be reduced by more than R3.5 billion, which is sufficient to build over 15 million square meters of housing or a considerable quantity of other social and cultural facilities.

Question: That is a very interesting figure. Of course, it is not the limit?

Answer: Of course not. We have reserves, considerable reserves, for saving material expenditure. Suffice it to say that the metal content of our machine-building products is higher than in other industrially developed countries. We could save no less than 3 million metric tons of metal simply by reducing machine weights to the level of the highest world equivalents. I would like to stress that the saving of material resources literally depends on each of us. Given the present gigantic scale of production, not losing a drop of fuel, not wasting a kilowatt-hour of electricity, not spoiling a potato tuber or a head of cabbage, not smashing a windowpane or a brick on a construction site, means perceptibly augmenting our social wealth.

Each of us must understand the simple truth that as we work, so do we live. Nobody else will "toss" us anything. We must earn everything ourselves. So if you are careless, if you smash a brick or a machine goes rusty through your fault, that means you are hitting your own pocket and the pocket of other members of our society. I repeat: This idea must be firmly impressed upon each of us.

Question: Used paper and paper waste possibly do not have the same "economic weight" as fuel and metal, but the fact that we are interested in utilizing this secondary raw material also needs no proof. At the same time, neither the collection nor the processing of waste paper is as yet being carried out in the best possible way.

Answer: I agree with you. The Gosplan is taking measures to make better use of secondary resources. There will be a particularly great improvement in the utilization of used tires, phosphogypsum, ash and cinder waste from thermal power stations, broken glass, waste paper, and other types of secondary raw materials. The planned volume of the utilization of secondary raw materials will make it possible to increase savings of primary raw materials by around R500 million in 1985. Primary raw materials worth R12.6 billion will be saved this year by using secondary raw materials. As you can see, it is a considerable amount.

Question: Nikolay Konstantinovich, which economic problem would you consider it necessary to particularly single out in the plan for 1985?

Answer: First and foremost, those sections and indicators in the plan connected with the implementation of the food and energy programs, and, of course, with the stepping up of the intensification process, which I have already spoken of in detail. Thus, in the plan for the development of the agro-industrial complex, we took full account of the food program targets and ensured the proportionate development of all the sectors that comprise it, as well as the future strengthening of their material and technical base. From all sources of finance, some R57 billion of capital investments are allocated the development of sectors of the agro-industrial complex, which is slightly more than envisaged for this year in the 5-year plan. There will be a substantial increase in investments designed to preserve the output produced, and in processing sectors to create additional capacities, making it possible to speed up the processing of agricultural raw materials and prevent losses of output.

As for the USSR energy program, here, with a view to further increasing electricity generation and improving the structure of the fuel and energy balance, the task of ensuring the preferential development of the nuclear power industry has been set. More than two-thirds of a total increase in electricity generation of 55 billion kilowatt-hours will be obtained at nuclear and hydroelectric power stations. The role of gas in the fuel balance will increase, and gas extraction will rise by 45 billion cubic meters, or nearly 8 percent.

Question: Please tell us about the consumer goods production program. In particular, what is being done to orient industry toward the production of articles in great demand?

Answer: In 1985, the increase in the output of nonfood consumer goods and the improvement in their quality and range will continue. As you know, at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session that examined the draft plan for 1985, it was noted that industry has proved to be unprepared for the change in consumer demand, which is shifting more and more to high quality goods. The need to more quickly reorient industry toward the production of articles in great demand was brought to the attention of all the central organs and union republic councils of ministers. The USSR Gosplan took these instructions into account in drawing up the plans for this year and the longer term.

Question: What tasks are agricultrual workers set by the plan? What must be done to resolve the main, crucial problem -- that of increasing grain production? What does the land reclamation program for this year entail?

Answer: The plans here are also very demanding. The task is to increase the volume of gross agricultrual output in 1985 to R143 billion -- R9 billion more than in 1984. It is proposed to obtain the entire increase in output by improving labor productivity, which is to rise by 9.7 percent on kolkhozes and sovkhozes over the years. Great attention has been paid to increasing grain and feed production as the basis for developing stockraising. An important reserve for increasing the gross yield of grain is to expand the areas sown to winter and spring wheat cultivated using industrial techniques. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo conducted a special examination of this question. Union republic councils of ministers, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, and the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences were informed of the need to take every measure to fulfill the decisions adopted and to achieve a substantial increase in the production of grain, above all of strong and durum wheat. Great attention is being paid to land reclamation. The problem of satisfying the country's demand for cotton and rice has now been resolved on the whole, thanks to land reclamation. A considerable proportion of the increase in the production of feed, vegetables, fruit, and grapes is down to irrigated lands. We now obtain approximately one-third of the total volume of arable output from reclaimed lands, even though they only compromise 14 percent of the total plowland area. As the CPSU Central Committee October (1984) Plenum noted, however, additional measures are needed to improve quality and speed up work on land reclamation and increase the efficiency with which irrigated and drained lands are used.

Large capital investments -- about R9 billion -- are being channeled into land reclamation in 1985. Some 663,000 hectares of irrigated land and 695,000 hectares of drained land will be opened up on the strength of these resources. The total area of reclaimed lands will be about 35 million hectares by the end of the year as against 29.8 million hectares in 1980.

Question: One big question: Could you give us a picture of the 12th 5-Year Plan targets? Gosplan is apparently already completing work on them, is it not?

Answer: In fact, work on the 12th 5-Year Plan is in full swing. It is for that very reason that it would be somewhat premature to talk about it. One thing is clear: we must radically improve production efficiency in the 12th 5-Year Plan and raise the introduction of scientific and technical achievements to a new and higher level. Only thus can we ensure the dynamic development of the national economy and the resolution of major social problems.

NOVOSTI OBSERVER ON USSR ECONOMIC INNOVATIONS

AU101313 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 9 Jan 85 p 7

["Specially dispatched" article for RABOTNICHESKO DELO, by Fedor Breus, NOVOSTI political observer: "Innovations in Economic Management"]

[Text] Against the general background of a dynamically developing Soviet economy, the enterprises from the five industrial branches where the experiment with the new economic system is being conducted, have particularly distinguished themselves with their high labor productivity and thriftiness. This experiment evoked great response in the Soviet public and also became known in the West, although it was heavily distorted there. The Soviet Union has by no means rejected the method of planning and has not introduced elements of the market economy in order to "rescue itself from stagnation" as some foreign observers claim.

The experiment is built upon an expansion of the enterprises' rights and of the rights of their workers' collectives in planning and all their economic activities, while the responsibility of individual enterprises and collectives for the results of work is increased in connection with the establishment of favorable conditions for the personal participation of each individual worker in production management.

The Soviet economy is still facing certain difficulties it must overcome -- difficulties caused by transition to an intensive development on the basis of the wide application of the achievement of scientific-technical progress in production. The announcements of the Central Statistical Administration deliberately point out indexes on how much outdated equipment is being eliminated from production, and on the amount and quality of new technical equipment now being introduced. The announcements also reflect the impact of such innovations upon labor productivity; they indicate how many workers have been released and transferred to other enterprises where manpower is needed.

Under the circumstances of this complicated process of acceleration, wasting working time is considered the greatest failure. It has been calculated that the loss of 1 minute of working time in production for the whole country is equal to the loss of the daily work of over 200,000 people. The 1984 results show that enterprises involved in the experiment and belonging to the ministries of heavy machine building, transportation machine building, and electrotechnical industry in the three republican branches (namely, light industry in Belorussia, food industry in the Ukraine, and local industry in Latvia) are not only fulfilling their tasks according to plan, but that their total rate of increase in production has been obtained thanks to labor productivity.

In addition to this, these enterprises have achieved the greatest savings in time, raw material, fuel, and electric power.

There is also another quite obvious factor: Considered on a long-term basis, it is not so much the economic effects, as the social results of the experiment, which will exert an even more profound impact upon social life.

The entire complex of measures for expanding rights and obligations, as well as the establishment of prerequisites for initiative and spirit of enterprise, are the basic elements in the programmatic documents of the Communist Party on the expansion of democracy. Realism is an invaluable asset of our democracy. Konstantin Chernenko stressed that the party attaches great importance to the real expansion and intensification of democracy. He stressed as follows in this context: Generally speaking, the question is to expand the creative forces of the people's socialist self-administration.

The USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decision that the experiment should be pursued and that its scope should expand in 1985. The experiment will include enterprises within a number of other all-union ministries, above all, those belonging to the machine-building sector. Individual branches in Azerbaijan, Moldavia, Estonia, the RSFSR, and other republics producing foodstuffs and mass consumer goods will also join the experiment.

Certain conditions of the experiment are being improved. For example, the effect of the economic mechanism upon scientific-technical progress is being intensified. Greater attention is being devoted to the improvement of style and methods of leadership in the enterprises on the part of the ministries, which will also devote their attention to the analysis of complicated processes, such as the timely discovery of crucial issues and a faster reaction to emerging problems.

The expansion of the experiment's scope raises the particularly acute problem of worker's mass requalification and the partial training of engineers and managers in connection with multifarious economic and administrative innovations. A series of measures are orienting the enterprises and their workers' collectives toward quality improvement in production and to an increase of export goods.

BRIEFS

ARCTIC NAVIGATION SEASON BEGINS -- The 1985 Arctic navigation season has begun. It was opened by the MV "(Kapitan Nazaryev)", which tied up today at Murmansk commercial seaport. Despite the very hard frosts and zero visibility because of mist off Kola Bay, the dockers immediately set about unloading the vessel. All the port's basic services are working in spite of the elements, ensuring the rhythmic work of the Polar transport conveyer. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jan 85 LD]

ANTARCTIC AIR BRIDGE LAID -- Airmen of the 30th Soviet Antarctic expedition have laid on 100-km air bridge over the Cosmonauts Sea in the Antarctic. Helicopters today linked the Molodezhnaya Observatory with the ice edge where the vessles Mikhail Somov, Pavel Korchagin and Baykal are moored. The difficult ice conditions of the current South Pole summer season did not permit the vessles to approach any closer to the observatory. Over several days, the polar workers and cargo for the new work shift will be transported by air. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 8 Jan 85 LD]

ACHIEVEMENTS, PROBLEMS IN ANIMAL HUSBANDRY CITED

LD122241 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 12 Jan 85

[From the "Land and People" program]

[Interview with Vyacheslav Mikaylovich Kozhevnikov, deputy head of the Animal Husbandry Products Main Administration, at the USSR Ministry of Agriculture by unnamed Radio Moscow correspondent — recorded]

[Text] [Interviewer] Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich, please tell us the results of the country's cattle breeders last year.

[Kozhevnikov] The kolkhoz and sovkhoz fulfilled the yearly plans of sales to the state of the basic types of animal husbandry products ahead of schedule by 24 December. On the whole for the year 1984, purchases of meat and milk grew by 4 percent, eggs by 3 percent, and wool by 1 percent. All union republics with the exception of the Kazakh SSR and the Uzbek SSR fulfilled their yearly plans. A significant increase in the production and purchase of products was guaranteed last year by the cattle-breeders of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Belorussia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and a large number of oblasts in the Russian Federation and the Ukraine. One must note the achievements of workers on farms of the Cherkassy Oblast, initiators of socialist competition for increased production and sales to the state of animal husbandry products in the 11th Five-Year Plan, who have successfully completed their plans for the 4 years. For the second year running, the country's kolkhoz' and sovkhoz' fulfillment of the plans for the basic types of animal husbandry products is a result of work being implemented in our country on the development of the agro-industrial complex. By comparison with 1982, the growth in meat purchases came to 2.2 million metric tons; milk, 8.2 million metric tons; eggs, more than 3 billion items. Here it should be noted that the increase in production has been achieved due to intensive factors: an increase in livestock productivity and labor productivity. The main tasks at present are to consolidate the positive results achieved in cattle-rearing and to secure high rates in the production of meat, milk, and other products from the first days of the new year.

[Interviewer] Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich, at present the first half of cattle wintering is already nearing its end, and in the majority of the country's regions, it is taking place more intensively than last year because of the harsher climatic conditions. Well, tell us please, do they tell on milk yields?

[Kozhevnikov] The results of many farm collectives show that even in these complicated conditions, well organized fodder preparation for rearing, strict observance of operational procedures [chetkoye soblyudeniye tekhnologicheskikh rezhimov], and constant attention to the cares and needs of cattle-rearers allow a stable increase in production. In the country's farms as a whole, for the last 3 months of wintering the average productivity of cows has risen by comparison with the previous wintering by 8 kilograms, milk procurement, by 457,000 tons, or 4 percent. Many kolkhoz and sovkhoz have also begun the current year none too badly. Livestock-rearers in the Baltic area and the Transcaucasus, Belorussia, Moldavia, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, many oblasts in the Non-Chernozem Zone, the Central Chernozem and the North-Caucasus areas of the Russian Federation are currently working with a good increase in milk yields by comparison with January of last year.

At the same time, the essential labor effort has not been established everywhere. As a check at a number of farms shows, schedules for fodder delivery to farms are not being observed, their preparation for rearing is badly organized, stoppages in water supply occur, and machine and equipment breakdowns are not being prevented in good time. All this tells negatively on production. On the farms of Perm and Kirov Oblasts, for example, there is a low provision of fodder. In addition, the fodder-preparation machinery does not always work efficiently, fodder for rearing is used quite often in unprepared form, and as a result, the state sold 6-10 percent less milk daily than last year. The productivity of animals is lower than last year at the moment on the kolkhoz and sovkhoz of the Uzbek SSR, Khabarovsk and Altay Krays, Dumurt and Chuvash Autonomous Republics, Volgograd, Gorkiy, Chita, Donetsk, Crimea, Semipalatinsk, and some other oblasts.

It is essential for the agricultural organs of these republics and oblasts, the managers and specialists on farms, to adopt the most energetic measures to correct the state of affairs on the farms. Rendering assistance to farms with low provisions of fodder must be constantly checked. The state has given great help in grain forage, and fodder redistribution is being carried out within oblasts and rayons. The main task at present is to complete the transfer of coarse and succulent fodder by February and to use the additional fodder reserves with maximum return. The remaining fodder should once again be reanalyzed in the 1 February account in order to complete its transportation to farms in good time before the spring period of bad roads. Particular attention must be devoted by farm managers and specialists to pasturing zones for livestock where a tense situation is currently forming, especially in the northeastern oblasts of Kazakhstan, the eastern rayons of the Kalmyk ASSR, on the pastures of Kizlyar, in Astrakhan Oblast, and in the Kirghiz ASSR.

It is essential to adopt timely measures to break up the ice crust on pastures, transport fodder, lead animals to more favorable areas, and improve the work of medical-prophylactic posts. A good deal has been done to solve these issues, but a number of places are still sluggish. Farms in Tajikistan are lagging behind in deliveries of coarse and concentrated fodder to wintering places, notwithstanding the fact that reserves of pasture fodder are lower there than last year. The success of wintering is primarily determined by the liking for hard work and the craftsmanship of the cattle-rearers. Therefore, it is very important to create an atmosphere of exacting and comradely mutual aid in each collective to more fully utilize team method possibilities, and to create material and moral stimuli to encourage industry's front-rankers. In the final result, all most contribute to the fact that farm workers must produce more milk, meat and other products in this complex period.

HARSH WINTER'S EFFECTS ON AGRICULTURE NOTED

LD112319 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 11 January broadcasts a 2-minute commentary by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy on the effects of the harsh winter conditions on Soviet agriculture.

Ruvinskiy says that animal wintering is taking place in complicated conditions; it is frosty even in places where this is extremely rare, and heavy snowfalls are making deliveries of feed difficult. Nonetheless, he says that on the majority of farms, animal productivity is now higher than in the comparatively warm days of last January. At the end of the year, all republics except Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan had fulfilled their annual plans for livestock production.

Ruvinskiy reports that in the country as a whole, according to the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the food program's control figures for the production of eggs and milk were reached; the farms of the Baltic republics, Belorussia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Turkmenia, and Armenia are now consolidating this success. The farms of the Chernozem oblasts and the Non-Chernozem Zone of the North Caucasus are now obtaining good increased weight and milk yields.

Ruvinskiy says, however, that in Western Siberia, especially in the Altay, as well as in Kermerovo, Chita, Volgograd, and Gorkiy Oblasts and some oblasts in the Ukraine, by no means everything is up to par, and that this year's wintering is also causing difficulties in the pastures of eastern Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, and Kalmykia. Great skill is required there to maintain the number of livestock and productivity. Unfortunately, Ruvinskiy continues, there have also been power cuts in recent days on livestock farms, which has led to milking machines, water supply, and other equipment lying idle. These power cuts sometimes last 2 or 3 days. It would seem, says Ruvinskiy in conclusion, that every one of these cases deserves the closest attention of the Ministry of Power and Electrification.

WEATHER DAMAGE REPORTED IN BELGOROD OBLAST

LD122321 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Jan 85

[Text] As previously reported, unexpected bad weather has caused damage in a number of areas in Belgorod Oblast. We have just got in touch with Nikolay Grebnev, our correspondent:

[Grebnev] Sharp temperature changes and a great deal of wet snow and rain have caused extensive icing of power lines and hampered road traffic.

Wires were broken under the heavy ice and power line pylons and even trees could not withstand the onslaught. Hundreds of settlements, farms and villages, primarily in Alekseyevskiy, Valuyskiy, Volokonovskiy, Krasnogvardeyskiy and other rayons, remained without power. Animal husbandry farms found themselves in the most difficult situation. However, nature did not cause confusion among people. The Belgorod party obkom and executive committee appeal to the oblast's population produced an urgent requirement among all those concenered with repairing the damage to carry out restoration work in the shortest possible time. The oblast headquarters just received the following information: pre-school and children's establishments, hospitals and communal enterprises are continuing normally using local power resources. Mechanized aid groups were sent in sufficient numbers to rural areas from Belgorod, Staryy Oskol and other oblast towns to work around-the-clock to restore power. This work continues. It was completed first in Rovenskiy Rayon.

JAPANESE TV ON SOVIET FORCES, WEAPONS

OW131510 [Editorial Report] Tokyo Broadcasting System Television Network in Japanese, relayed in Okinawa by Naha RBC TV, carries at 1100 GMT on 13 January a 50-minute "Sunday Golden Special" program introducing the Soviet Armed Forces entitled "This is the Soviet Armed Forces -- The World's Strongest Armed Forces Thoroughly Made Public," the program shows Soviet films depicting Soviet ground, air, and naval forces in training and TBS-produced films showing an interview with Colonel General Semen P. Ivanov, assigned to the Main Inspectorate of the Defense Ministry, and a TBS crew's visit to the Taman guards motorized rifle divison where the crew interviews a senior lieutenant. What appear to be Japanese government-produced films of Soviet aircraft and warships are also shown.

In presenting the program, TBS newscaster Takeo Morimoto says: "After appealing to the Soviet authorities [about a lack of information on the Soviet Union] and after long negotiations, we have succeeded in covering the Soviet Armed Forces directly; and we believe that this is a rare case in the world."

While showing weapons and equipment, Morimoto, in the studio, intermittently talks with military commentator Hisanaga Mineo, author of books on Soviet forces and part of the TBS coverage crew. Topics include the threat of the Soviet forces, their development, buildup, and qualitative improvement, their deployment in the Far East, and the scheduled resumption of U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks.

In conclusion, Mineo, giving his impressions of his visit to the Soviet Union, says, "the Soviet Union is a gigantic country; but, militarily, she is poor in the area of releasing information as compared with the United States. That is linked to the threat of the Soviet forces."

In his interview, Col Gen Ivanov reads a prepared statement to the Japanese people explaining the defensive nature of Soviet military activities and answering Mineo's questions about the deployment of Soviet forces to the Far East, including the SS-20 missiles.

The weapons and equipment shown in the program include BMP-2 infantry combat vehicles, AT-3 antitank missiles, SA-7 portable antiaircraft missiles, SA-9 surface-to-air-missiles, SS-1 battle support missiles, M1974 122-mm self-propelled mortars, T-72 main battle tanks, the aircraft carrier Minsk, TU-26 backfire bombers, TU-16 Badger bombers, MI-24 attack helicopters, MI-8 transport helicopters, PMP pontoon bridges, Victor-II class nuclear-powered submarines, Kresta-II class missile cruisers, Krivak-II class missile cruisers, Turya class torpedo hydrofoils, MIG-23 fighters, SU-15 fighters, MIG-25's and MIG-27's, M-4 Bison bombers, AN-22's, and IL-76 transport planes.

General Ivanov Interview

OW141046 Tokyo Braodcasting System Television Network in Japanese 1100 GMT 13 Jan 85 (Tentative)

[Interview with Colonel General Semen P. Ivanov of the Main Inspectorate of the USSR Defense Ministry by military commentator Hisanaga Mineo on the "Sunday Golden Special" program, "This is the Soviet Armed Forces" -- date and place of interview not indicated; Ivanov speaks in Russian with Japanese translation appearing in subtitles; the following translation is from the Japanese subtitles]

[Text] [Ivanov] [reads from a piece of paper] Dear Japanese friends, you will see films of the troops of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The films introduce the activities of our forces whose mission is only to defend the sovereignty and independence of the Soviet Union and its allies. Our aspirations for peace and desire not to permit a global war are indeed great and irreplaceable. As long as there is a possibility of a war being provoked, we think that it is necessary to maintain defense capabilities and combat readiness so that we can thoroughly annihilate the aggressors who dare to infringe upon the peaceful life of our people. [stops reading]

Now, although you make a distinction between the Far East and Western Europe, there is no change to the fact that our adversary is the United States. If the United States is allowed an extensive reservation or military bases in Japan, we will talk about the United States, no longer about Japan. As our government leaders have clarified not just once, we will never allow the United States to attain military superiority.

[Mineo] General, I would like to ask you a question. Of late the Soviet Union has built up its forces considerably in the Far Eastern region. In that regard, what is the basic idea of the Soviet Union?

[Ivanov] [reads from a piece of paper] Regarding our Far Eastern front, inasmuch as the danger of war arising from the United States and its allies has increased, the Soviet Union is finding it inevitable to take measures to build up defense. The speculation about a Soviet military buildup being advertised by specific circles in Japan is circulated for the purpose of arousing terror and enmity against our country and justifying the war preparations by the United States in that region. In truth, the military potential of the Soviet Far East forces does not go beyond the framework of defense. This is the same in the case of the SS-20's